

UNCLASSIFIED

(2)

THE SACRED AND THE SWORD: A STUDY OF HOW RELIGIONS VIEW WAR

by

REO N. LESLIE, JR.

Lieutenant Commander, CHC, USN



THE UNITED STATES NAVAL WAR COLLEGE

NAVAL WAR COLLEGE

Newport, RI

June, 1990

DTIC
ELECTE
OCT 10 1990
S E D

THE VIEWS CONTAINED HEREIN ARE THOSE OF THE AUTHOR, AND PUBLICATION OF THIS RESEARCH BY THE ADVANCED RESEARCH PROGRAM, NAVAL WAR COLLEGE, DOES NOT CONSTITUTE ENDORSEMENT THEREOF BY THE NAVAL WAR COLLEGE, THE DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY, OR ANY OTHER BRANCH OF THE U. S. GOVERNMENT.

APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE: DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED.

UNCLASSIFIED

AD-A227 263

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

1a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED			1b. RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS N/A	
2a. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY			3. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY OF REPORT Unlimited	
2b. DECLASSIFICATION / DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE				
4. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)			5. MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)	
6a. NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION Advanced Research Program		6b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable)	7a. NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION	
6c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) Naval War College Newport, RI 02841-5010			7b. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code)	
8a. NAME OF FUNDING / SPONSORING ORGANIZATION		8b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable)	9. PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER	
8c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code)			10. SOURCE OF FUNDING NUMBERS	
			PROGRAM ELEMENT NO.	PROJECT NO.
11. TITLE (Include Security Classification) THE SACRED AND THE SWORD: A STUDY OF HOW RELIGIONS VIEW WAR				
12. PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) LESLIE, JR. REO NAPOLEON, LCDR, CHC, USN				
13a. TYPE OF REPORT FINAL	13b. TIME COVERED FROM MAR 90 TO JUN 90	14. DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day) 1990 JUNE 1	15. PAGE COUNT 188	
16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION				
17. COSATI CODES			18. SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) religion and war, just war, war, use of force, ethics and war, religion, ethics, morality and war.	
FIELD	GROUP	SUB-GROUP		
19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) How various religious traditions view war and military ethics is studied. Goddess religion, Chinese religion, Hinduism, Buddhism, Judaism, Christianity and Islam are examined. These religions were selected because of their present or potential influence in domestic and international politics and/or presence in the US armed forces. Research was done by studying primary sources, scriptures, secondary sources and faith group archive records and interviewing adherents. All religions have well developed concepts of just war and just conduct in war consistent with the Laws of Armed Conflict. Recommendations for enhancing awareness of domestic and global religious pluralism are made.				
20. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> UNCLASSIFIED / UNLIMITED <input type="checkbox"/> SAME AS RPT <input type="checkbox"/> DTIC USERS			21. ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified	
22a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL Head, Advanced Research Program, NWC			22b. TELEPHONE (Include Area Code) (701) 841-5304/3359	22c. OFFICE SYMBOL 35

DD FORM 1473, 84 MAR

83 APR edition may be used until exhausted
All other editions are obsolete

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE

★ U.S. Government Printing Office: 1989-538-112

0102-LF-014-6602

ADVANCED RESEARCH PROJECT CERTIFICATION

THE SACRED AND THE SWORD: A STUDY OF HOW RELIGIONS VIEW WAR

by

Reo N. Leslie, Jr.

I submit this paper to the Director of the Advanced Research Program in partial satisfaction of the requirements of the Center for Naval Warfare Studies.

Signature: Reo N. Leslie, Jr.

Reo N. Leslie, Jr.
LCDR, CHC, USN

Full Name of Faculty Advisor: CAPT M. E. Bowman
JAGC, USN

Academic/Staff Title: DIVISION HEAD, INTL LAW

Per Naval War College Research Guide, I certify that this paper is substantively acceptable, and that this manuscript is free of typographical, spelling, and other grammatical errors and is ready for evaluation.

Date: 31 May 1990

Advisor's Signature: [Signature]

Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DTIC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	
By	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A-1	



TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	11
I	INTRODUCTION: RELIGION, WAR AND CULTURE	1
II	GODDESS RELIGION	6
	The Great Goddess and Goddess-Orientated Cultures	6
	The Indo-European Invasions and the Cultural Shift ...	6
	Contemporary Goddess Religion and War	14
III	CHINESE RELIGION AND PHILOSOPHY	20
	Lao Tzu and Taoism	20
	Confucius and Confucianism	22
	Mo Tzu and Moism	25
	Sun Tzu and <u>The Art of War</u>	28
	Shang Yang and Legalism	31
IV	HINDUISM	37
	The Aryan Origins of Hinduism	37
	The Kshatriya, War and the Scriptures	39
	Contemporary Hinduism and War.....	44
V	BUDDHISM	51
	The Basics of Buddhism	51
	Buddhism and War	54
	The Religion of the Samurai	58
	Buddhism and Japanese Militarism	61
VI	JUDAISM	68
	Judaism and War	68
	The Types of War	70
	Jewish Resistance to Oppression	74

	Eschatology and War	75
	Contemporary Judaism and War	77
VII	CHRISTIANITY	81
	The Ethics of Jesus	81
	Early Christianity and War	81
	The Just War Tradition	84
	Nonresistance and Pacifism	89
	The Church and the World	93
VIII	ISLAM	97
	The Basics of Islam	97
	Jihad: The "Sixth Pillar" of Righteous War	98
	The Koran and War	104
	Contemporary Islam and War	106
IX	CONCLUSION: THE WAY OF THE SACRED AND THE WAY OF THE SWORD	113
X	RECOMMENDATIONS	117
	APPENDIX I: INTERVIEW WITH DR. NORMAN CHAMBERS	118
	APPENDIX II: INTERVIEW WITH DR. GAYE SWENSON AND MS. VANDA OSMON	121
	APPENDIX III: INTERVIEW WITH MR. TED KARDESH	127
	APPENDIX IV: INTERVIEW WITH DRUTAKARMA	134
	APPENDIX V: INTERVIEW WITH IMAM AQUEEL EL-AMIN	139
	APPENDIX VI: INTERVIEW WITH REV. MADELON WHEELER-GIBB	146
	APPENDIX VII: INTERVIEW WITH DR. ALAN BLOOM	153
	APPENDIX VIII: INTERVIEW WITH REV GWYNNE SCHULTZ	160

APPENDIX IX: INTERVIEW WITH CHAPLAIN JOHNATHAN

PANITZ 166

APPENDIX X: MO TZU'S RITE FOR DEFENSIVE WAR 170

BIBLIOGRAPHY 172

Executive Summary of

THE SACRED AND THE SWORD: A STUDY OF HOW RELIGIONS VIEW WAR

Religion has a dramatic influence on the culture of any nation or group of people. Attitudes, morals and ethical values rooted in religious concepts influence how a nation uses force as an extension of policy. In turn, moral and ethical values affect morale and the morale of the individual warrior frequently is a decisive factor in battle. The purpose of this research is to comparatively study how various religious traditions view war. The reason for this is basic; knowing what the religious practitioner thinks and how faith influences military behavior is necessary to maintain an effective fighting force.

Understanding the impact of faith on the use of force is important for both domestic and international reasons. In the United States citizens are increasingly practicing faiths other than Judaism and Christianity. While in uniform they will want to exercise their Constitutional right to express their religious preference through worship.

Globally, religion is an even more dominant factor in international relations. The conflict between Israel and the Arab states, the Shi'a Muslim revolution in Iran and the tension between India and Pakistan over Kashmir are examples of this. As the international political, economic and security environment shifts from a bi-polar world centered on Communist and democratic camps to a multi-polar world centered on regional powers and blocs, the role of religion for potential allies and

potential adversaries increases in the body politic.

Clearly then, understanding the ideological place of religion in influencing or motivating political or military behavior is essential.

The religious traditions studied are expected to have a clear political influence in the present or near future. Religions that lack significant intellectual influence on the contemporary national and world scene have been omitted. The selected faiths, seven in number, include those practiced by citizens of the United States, potential allies and potential adversaries.

For this study, which includes Goddess religion, Chinese religion and philosophy, Hinduism, Buddhism, Judaism, Christianity and Islam, the author conducted research through review of scriptures holy to the faiths, secondary sources and archival material, attendance at worship services, religious education classes and adherent interviews.

Some of the conclusions reached include:

- All religions studied have views on war and military ethics.
- All religions studied, with minor variations, generally view the use of force in the same manner.
- All religions studied have criteria for the use of force consistent with the more secular Law of Armed Conflict.
- All religions studied see the use of military power as a necessary, though regrettable, part of a less than perfect world.

-All religions studied generally view war as the last resort of a nation after all other avenues are exhausted.

-All religions studied view self-defense and humanitarian intervention as the only legitimate just causes for the use of force.

-All religions studied realize a need to maintain a balance between the ideal and the real (the highest principles of the faith vs. the reality of human society).

-All religions studied have both a militant stream which advocates the use of force for national or political purposes and a pacifist stream which advocates nonviolence in all possible circumstances. Both extremes are balanced by a majority "mainstream" view.

-All religions studied acknowledge their institutional structures have been the tools of political authorities in enforcing state rule and waging war.

-All religions studied communicate willingness to endorse military chaplains.

The author determined that the number of American adherents in non-Judeo-Christian religions should be expected to increase. This is due in part to the increase in Asian immigrants to the United States practicing their historical religions. Another reason is the conversion of non-immigrant Americans to these religions. Because these demographics have military significance, some specific recommendations to enhance understanding of religious pluralism in the military are:

-Increase military education on all levels, especially the

PCO/PXO pipeline, on the military implications of religion in the ethnic, gender, legal, ethical and Constitutional areas.

- Institute command level seminars on individual rights to practice the religion of choice in the same vein as the race relations, rights and responsibilities, ethics and sexual harassment workshops mandated by DOD policy.

- Provide for representation of the "new religions" in the Chaplain Corps of the armed forces.

- Highlight common American values through celebrations like service birthdays, ecumenical prayer breakfasts, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. commemoration services and POW/MIA recognition days.

This paper provides an overview and starting point for the study of religion and war. The interested reader will receive a framework to evaluate the relationship between the sacred and the sword.

Chapter I

Introduction: Religion, War and Culture

In his great treatise, On War, Carl von Clausewitz speaks of factors that nations should consider when they utilize war as an instrument of politics. In his discussion Clausewitz mentions, among other things, military spirit and the role of moral values in war:

Theory becomes infinitely more difficult as soon as it touches the realm of moral values. Military activity is never directed against material force alone, it is always aimed simultaneously at the moral forces which gave it life, and the two cannot be separated. But moral values can only be perceived by the inner eye, which differs in each person at different times. Since danger is the common element in which everything moves in war, courage, the sense of one's own strength, is the principle factor that influences judgement. It is the lens, so to speak, through which impressions pass to the brain. Everyone gauges his opponent in the light of his reputed talents, his age, and his experience and acts accordingly. Everyone tries to assess the spirit and temper of his own troops and of the enemy's. 1

Since religion influences culture, matters spiritual or things religious necessarily are a factor in war. Among the ways religion influences war are the following:

- (a) Inescapably, a national ethic must consider war and the use of force.
- (b) The morality of the individual warrior about war and the use of force may shape national actions.
- (c) The morale and esprit de corps of the warriors frequently are decisive factors in battle.
- (d) The definitions about appropriate conduct during the war, especially towards the enemy and the "innocents," will shape

both conduct of the war effort and public support.

(e) The dualistic "us" versus "them" nature of the war² frequently has to be fueled by religious differences.

The purpose of this research is to discuss how religious traditions view war. Understanding the impact of religion on the use of force is important for both domestic and international reasons. In the United States citizens increasingly are practicing faiths other than the "traditional" realm of Judaism and Christianity. Many are first or second generation immigrants practicing historical faiths. Others are converts from religions in the Jewish or Christian heritage or spiritual seekers proceeding to their religion from no previous affiliation at all. Their presence is felt in our contemporary armed forces and their numbers likely will increase as the next century approaches. While in uniform they will want to exercise their Constitutional right to express their religious preference through worship.

On the global scale, religion is an even more dominant factor in international relations. Both the conflict between Israel and the Arab states and the desire of Iran to export its brand of Islamic revolution are rooted in the religious ideas of the Middle East. As the international political, economic and security environment moves increasingly from a bi-polar world centered on the United States and the Soviet Union to a multi-polar world centered on regional powers and blocs, the role of religion in the body politic of potential allies and potential adversaries increases also. In Asia, for

example, religion is an important factor in the political life of Japan, India and Pakistan. If Communism's influence on Chinese culture begins to wane, the religions and philosophies part of the historical civilization of China surely will enjoy a resurgence.

Out of concern for an understanding of contemporary views on religion and war, this survey is limited faith groups which may be expected to have a clear political influence in the present or near future.

Goddess religion, Chinese religion and philosophy, Hinduism, Buddhism, Judaism, Christianity and Islam are the traditions to be studied because of their well-developed views on the use of force and their influence on United States, regional or global thinking and behavior. Religions that lack intellectual influence on the contemporary national and world scene are not included in this research. Aztec religion and Zoroastrianism, to name two, have well developed ethics of war. They are omitted because they offer no practical guidance for contemporary purposes. Religious traditions discussed in the paper will include those practiced by citizens of the United States and nations that are potential allies or potential adversaries. The importance and degree of intellectual influence these selected traditions provide was a subjective determination by the author.

The text of this study is divided chapters, each of which discusses a religious tradition and its influence on war. Since the purpose of is to examine how religions view "just

war" and "just conduct" during war historical and theological discussion are limited to these themes in order to narrow and focus the research. The greatest extent of historical detail is found in Chapter II because of the unique view of Goddess religion that the genesis of war is rooted in a specific period of history and pre-history. A great deal of research came from interviews. Each interview done during the research is attached as an appendix. This provides the reader with a greater opportunity to study each specific religion, or its attitudes about war.

Chapter I Endnotes

1. Micheal Howard and Peter Paret (ed.) Carl von Clausewitz, On War (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1984), p. 136-137.
2. Interview with Dr. Norman Chambers 19 April 1990. (see Appendix I)

Chapter II

GODDESS RELIGION

The Great Goddess and Goddess Cultures

In the Latin classical novel The Golden Ass written by Lucius Apuleius in the Second Century AD, the deity known as the Great Goddess gives a powerful and poetic self-description when he invokes her in prayer:

You see me here, Lucius, in answer to your prayer. I am Nature, the universal Mother, mistress of all the elements, primordial child of time, sovereign of all things spiritual, queen of the dead, queen also of the immortals, the single manifestation of all gods and goddesses that are. My nod governs the shining heights of Heaven, the wholesome se-breezes, the lamentable silence of the world below. Though I am worshipped in many aspects, known by countless names, and propitiated with all manner different rites, yet the whole round earth venerates me. The primeval Phrygians call me Pessinuntica, Mother of the gods; the Athenians, sprung from their own soil, call me Cecropian Artemis; for the islanders of Cyprus I am Paphian Aphrodite; for the archers of Crete I am Dichtynna; for the trilingual Sicilians, Stygian Proserpine; and for the Eleusinians their ancient Mother of the Corn.

Some know me as Juno, some as Bellona of the Battles; others as Hecate, others again as Rhamnubia, but both races of Aethiopians, whose lands the morning sun first shines upon, and the Egyptians who excel in ancient learning and worship me with ceremonies proper to my godhead, call me by my true name, namely, Queen Isis. I have come in pity of your plight, I have come to favor and aid you. Weep no more, lament no longer; the hour of deliverance, shone over by my watchful light, is at hand. 1

Today those who worship her have united in their religion feminism, politics, psychology, spirituality, ecological concerns and peace issues. Who is this Great Goddess? In prehistoric times the Great Goddess was worshipped by

Neolithic peoples who associated her with fertility,
agriculture and the Earth itself.² In many Neolithic
societies she was represented as a trinity; a young woman, a
young woman giving birth and an old woman, or the mistress of
animals like birds and snakes.³ Many scholars consider the
worship of the Great Goddess to be the oldest of all religious
traditions.

Much study of Goddess religion has focused on one epoch
of human history and pre-history. In the period referred to
as "Old Europe," which covers the time before 4,500 BCE, there
was a high culture that thrived during the late Neolithic and
Copper Age. The Old Europe culture was matrilineal,
sedentary, peaceful, art-loving, and bound to the Earth and
the seas. The second emerging culture was patriarchal,
mobile, warlike, indifferent to art and oriented to the sky.

The representative of the Goddess was the queen-priestess
who ruled. The brother or husband of the queen-priestess
supervised agriculture and trade. Society was organized in a
structure more religious and social in character than it was
military, political or civil.⁴ Archaeological evidence shows
that Goddess cultures were equalitarian in the social roles of
men and women. There was no subordination of women or
patriarchal or patrilineal emphasis as in the Indo-European
cultures that would gain dominance.

Studies show that "the Goddess, not gods, dominated the
Old European pantheon" and the Goddess, sometimes with a male

consort or a son, "ruled absolutely over human, animal and plant life" and generated the creation and life force of the universe in the theology of these early cultures. It is reminiscent of Lao Tzu who in the Tao Te Ching, referred to the Tao, the creative and governing principle of the universe, as "the Mother of All Things" and "the Subtle Female."⁵ The Goddess, was celebrated and worshipped in temples throughout Old Europe. Women supervised the preparation and performance of religious rites dedicated to the various aspects, functions and manifestations of the Goddess. The Goddess was associated with, among other things, the Moon, certain animals like the bird, the fish and the serpent, the Sea, birth, death and the "Black Madonnas" found throughout southeastern Europe, Spain, France and Italy in ancient times.⁶

Remnants of Goddess religion were to survive the ascendancy of patriarchal and patrilineal culture. It is believed by feminist theologians, some historians and others that such diverse historical phenomena as the cult of Mary in the Roman Catholic Church and witchcraft were manifestations of Goddess religion.⁷

The Indo-European Invasion and the Cultural Shift

The Goddess cultures thrived for at least 20,000 years before the confrontation with an opposing way of life took place. The Old Europe culture which, according to UCLA archaeologist Marija Gimbutas, dated from at least 7,000 to 4,500 BCE, was a society of creativity, peace and cooperation

with an absence of fortifications and military, as opposed to
hunting, weapons.⁸ The change in the social and spiritual
fabric of Goddess-oriented cultures in Europe, and ultimately
in Asia also, began with the migrations of peoples generally
called "Indo-Europeans" or "Aryans" in history. Approximately
4,500 BCE these peoples, also called "Kungars" by Gimbutas,
began wars of conquest against the indigenous population of
Old Europe. These invaders brought a culture based on the
hardship of a nomadic life slaughtering animals and suffering
the inhospitable environment of the colder steppes.

The beliefs and practices of the Indo-European peoples
were centered on the dominance of the male over the female,
glorification of war, gods of war that resided in the sky and
a patrilinear culture. These incursions into Europe by the
steppe peoples took place in three major concentrations:
4,400-4,300 BCE, 3,400 BCE and 3,000-2,900 BCE.⁹ With each
invasion, Old Europe underwent upheaval. The two cultures
became more and mixed, the God armed with sword and
thunderbolt alongside the Goddess with serpent, bird, fish and
egg, until eventually the older Goddess religion was coopted
or eliminated by the patriarchal societies.

The legends of Atlantis are believed to be a reference to
the pre-Aryan cultures of Old Europe, probably the Goddess-
oriented Minoan high-culture of Crete.¹⁰ The ancient Greek
poet Hesoid writes of a "golden race" of peaceful agrarians

eventually conquered and supplanted by a "lesser race" of war-like peoples.¹¹ His works are probably another reference to this cultural shift.

The new spiritual ideology was based on the warrior and horseman culture of the invaders from the steppes that conquered Europe. The chief gods carried weapons or thunderbolts and rode horses or chariots. In contrast to indigenous conquered peoples with sacred myths that revolved around water, the seas, the female and nature, the religion of the Indo-European pastoral, semi-sedentary and more war-like peoples was oriented to the Sun, the stars, the planets,¹² thunder, lightning and other phenomena of the sky.

The previous sacred myths of Goddess cultures were re-told, re-written or re-structured to negate female expression of divinity. Male gods adapted qualities previously attributed to the Great Mother or other goddesses. For example, male deities became "creators" and "gave birth."¹³

In the realm of religion, patriarchy banned females from leading rituals and rites. No female "clergy" were allowed. In nations like Babylon and late Egypt sun cults, with all-male priesthoods leading worship of the Sun God, were established by the state. These orders of male priests welded great political power. The male deity ruled both in the sky and on the earth.

In patriarchal cultures women were reduced to the level of slavery. "In early patriarchy, women's ancient community

tasks were turned into slave labor" says Sjöo and Mor, "Woman, in male eyes was no longer a powerful creator in her own right, but a piece of property. Women produced the surplus products on which men based their secular power and control."¹⁴

When patriarchal polytheism began to give way to patriarchal monotheism the status of women in religion and society did not improve. The supreme divinity of Judaism, Christianity and Islam was not a Goddess or even a God with a female partner. The Supreme Deity of the Semitic religions was a "jealous" male who tolerated no worship of another god or goddess.

Even more, the inferiority of women in religion and society was further institutionalized by the monotheisms patriarchy. All male priesthoods were inherited from the polytheistic patriarchal cults. Evil and the woman were equated as one and the same. Just as the patriarchy of Greece taught that evil was brought into the world by a woman, Pandora, the patriarchal monotheisms taught that evil and "original sin" came into the world through a woman, Eve.

A male Jew was taught to pray, "Blessed art thou o Lord, our God, King of the Universe, who has not made me a woman."¹⁵ The Old Testament prophets preached against Israelites who worshipped "the Queen of Heaven." Christianity suppressed sexuality, the vehicle of creativity and reflective of the creative power of the Goddess, and equated it with sin, evil and paganism. Women were "unclean" during their monthly

menstrual cycle. The female was to obey not only the religious and political ruling class of the patriarchal culture, but all men, especially husbands. Men were to avoid being "seduced into evil and sin" by women who were "wicked" and "agents of the Devil."

In the view of patriarchal religion "warfare was an end ^{in 16} itself, a form of play in the strict sense of the word." The blade, the sword and other instruments of violence became the symbols of male - dominated culture. After the Indo -European conquest, the art work of the eras begins to reflect the dominant Aryan mindset. Images of deities bearing arms and proliferated as patriarchy ascended and Goddess culture descended.

Even in death, the ruling class males retained their weapons. Spears, axes, swords, knives, bows and arrows were ¹⁷ buried with the male warrior. The patriarchal culture placed great value on the technology of death, destruction and domination.

Not only the patriarchal polytheisms, but the patriarchal monotheisms as well developed theologies of war, "holy war", to elevate the use of force to the level of divine sanction and the blessing of the divine powers - that - be. In Hinduism, for example, the religion imposed on the indigenous Dravadians of India by the Aryan Conquerors, warfare was the

sacred responsibility of the kshatriya knighthood. Warfare was a holy sacrament. A kshatriya warrior is expected to die¹⁸ in combat. Any other form of death was a grave sin.

In discussing Aryan religion, Aho states in his excellent work Religious Mythology and the Art of War that "their mythologies, as reflected in Beowulf, the Illiad and the Rig Veda were consistent with the violent life of war loving tribespeople" with "typically, the dominant figure" being a male war god, Wodan, Zeus or Indra for example, residing in the sky, who fought a last battle with a feminine archrival."¹⁹ Judaism, Christianity and Islam all developed "holy wars," "crusades" and "inquisitions" waging war in the name and cause of God.

In patriarchal wars, women were not only victims, but booty. A common Indo-European practice was to kill all men and children in conquered Old Europe territory and keep the women as slaves, wives or concubines.²⁰ Archaeological research shows "that in some Kurgan camps the bulk of the female population was not Kurgan, but rather of the Neolithic²¹ Old European population."

The patriarchal attitude that women were male property and part of the spoils of war can be seen in the Bible when the Hebrew tribes invade Canaan in a "holy war" for the Promised Land. In Numbers 31:32-35 it states: "The plunder remaining from the spoils that the soldiers took was 675,000 sheep, and 72,000 cattle, 61,000 donkeys, and 32,000 women who

had never slept with a man (New International Version translation)." Women, like animals, were part of the "spoils" and "plunder" of war.

Thus, feminist theologians link war, patriarchy, social structures of domination and hierarchy as interweaving and interlocking threads of the same garment. War is "a primary patriarchal contribution to culture, almost entirely absent from the matriarchal societies of the Neolithic and early Bronze Ages." ²² War to them is not a permanent reality of human existence, but only the outgrowth of a particular type of culture.

Contemporary Goddess Religion and War

Goddess religion is expressed today in ecological movements, peace groups, Wiccan covens, feminist religions and neo-pagan faiths. In research interviews I conducted with feminist theologians and Goddess spirituality practitioners these general views on war were articulated:

- (a) War represents the result of over-emphasizing the male principle over the feminine principle in human culture.
- (b) The over-emphasis on male values like domination, aggression, competition, hierarchy, "conquest of nature" and separation generate political and economic systems that lead to war. War is simply a higher level of competition for domination between male-ruled societies.
- (c) Sexism, racism, and militarism are all inter-related values of patriarchal culture.

(d) Values rooted in the feminine principle such as cooperation, creation, nurture, reconciliation, harmonious with nature, sharing and caretaking must be emphasized in human culture to correct the imbalance of the over-emphasis on the male principle.

These ideas are discussed in greater detail in Appendix II, Appendix III, Appendix VI and Appendix VIII. To those who respect the Goddess she is seen as a force for ecological responsibility, justice and peace. Barbara Walker states that "even when Goddess worship was beginning to give way to the cults of aggressive gods, for a long time the appearance of the Goddess imposed peace on all hostile groups."²³ The Roman Tacitus said that whenever the Goddess moved in her chariot at certain seasons to certain sacred places, the people "do not go to battle or wear arms, every weapon is under lock; peace and quiet are known and welcomed."²⁴

Although generally peace-oriented, those interviewed did acknowledge an "asessive" side of Goddess religion symbolized by the goddess Athena, protector of civilized life, agriculture and handicrafts. She was the daughter of Zeus born fully adult and armored from the head of her father according to Greek mythology. Athena was a battle goddess and patron deity of the Greek city-state Athens. Some feminist activists feeling a need to engage in both social action and Goddess spirituality find Athena a useful archetype.²⁵ The

merger of Goddess religion and Indo-European based thought reached a point in history when unlike the self-description of Isis quoted from the Golden Ass at the beginning of this chapter, the Great Goddess says of herself in a Ptolemaic era cultic creed:

I am the queen of war. I am the queen of the
thunderbolt. I stir up the sea and calm it. I am
the rays of the Sun. 26

Generally, although they acknowledge "warrior queens" from Zenobia and Boadicea in antiquity to Margaret Thatcher and Indira Gandhi in contemporary times, feminist and Goddess spirituality practitioners believe their faith calls them to embody the values of the feminine principle of humanity rather than the values of the male principle of humanity.

In summary, those who follow different aspects of Goddess religion believe war is only another manifestation of values rooted in the male principle and patriarchal culture such as domination and competition. They lift up the golden age of peaceful Goddess-oriented agrarian cultures that existed before the Aryan invasions as a model for a world free of war, conflict, division and chauvinism. All use of force by nations is viewed with deep suspicion and mistrust. As Starhawk, a prominent author and leader of Goddess religion stated in her essay "Ethics and Justice in Goddess Religion" the theological view of her faith that all life is sacred demands a reorientation of values in culture perpetuated by patriarchal religion:

Human life is valuable and sacred. Consequences are suffered collectively, because it is our collective responsibility as a society to change those practices that destroy the lives of individuals and the interplay of life-forms around us. No external God, Goddess, angel or convoy of visitors from another planet will do this for us. We must create justice and ecological and social balance, this is the prime concern, the bottom line, the nitty gritty of ethics in a world view that sees deity as immanent in human life and the world we live in. Life, being sacred, demands our full participation. 27

Chapter II Endnotes

1. Robert Graves (translator), The Golden Ass (New York: The Noonday Day Press, 1989) pp. 264-265.
2. "Goddess Worship: An Overview," The Encyclopedia of Religion, 1937 ed., v. 6, p. 36.
3. Ibid, p. 37.
4. Charlene Spretnak, ed., The Politics of Women's Spirituality (New York: Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1982), p. 23.
5. R. L. Wing, translator, The Tao of Power (New York: Doubleday, 1986), pp. 27 and 37.
6. Monica Sjöo and Barbara Mor, The Great Cosmic Mother (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1987), p. 31.
7. Barbara Walker, The Woman's Encyclopedia of Myths and Secrets (New York: Harper and Row, 1983), pp. 602-613, 1081-1091.
8. David Loye, "Who Murdered Peace and Prosperity?," New Age Journal, July/August 1987, p. 36.
9. Spretnak, op.cit., p. 30.
10. Riane Eisler, The Chalice and the Blade, San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1988), p. 63.
11. Ibid, p. 62.
12. Spretnak, op.cit., p. 31.
13. Sjöo and Mor, op.cit., pp. 230-243.
14. Ibid, p. 240.
15. Merlin Stone, When God Was a Woman (New York: Harvest/HBJ, 1976), p. 224.

16. James A. Aho, Religious Mythology and the Art of War (Westport, Conn: Greenwood Press 1981), p. 23.
17. Eisler, op.cit., p. 50.
18. Aho, op.cit., p. 62.
19. Ibid, p. 60.
20. Eisler, op.cit., p. 49.
21. Ibid.
22. Walker, op.cit., p. 1058.
23. Ibid, p. 1058
24. Ibid.
25. Interviews with Vanda Osmon, Gaye Swenson and Gwynne Schultz (see Appendices II and VIII).
26. Antonia Fraser, The Warrior Queens (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1989), p. 27.
27. Spretnak, op.cit., pp. 420-421.

CHAPTER III

CHINESE RELIGION AND PHILOSOPHY

Lao Tzu and Taoism

Though not necessarily pacifists, Chinese philosophers generally held a dim view of war. Chinese philosophy places a high emphasis on harmony. For example, both harmony between humanity and the universe and harmony within society are essential in Chinese thinking. Since war is the most violent disruption of harmony in society it is only natural that Chinese philosophy generally condemns it.¹

Taoist skepticism about formal government leads naturally to a condemnation of war and all kinds of violence. Conquest by force of arms and weapons themselves, are viewed negatively in Taoism. In chapter 31 of the Tao Te Ching Lao Tzu writes:

The finest weapons can be the instruments of
misfortune, And thus contrary to Natural Law.
Those who possess the Tao turn away from them.
Evolved leaders occupy and honor the left;
Those who use weapons honor the right.
Weapons are instruments of misfortune,
That are used by the unevolved.
When their use is unavoidable,
The superior act with calm restraint.
Even when victorious, let there be no joy,
For such joy leads to contentment with slaughter.
Those who are content with slaughter.
Cannot find fulfillment in the world. 2

In this passage although the use of force is regarded as a necessary evil, Lao Tzu cautions restraint, prudence and a superior attitude for military leadership. In this passage left refers to the symbolism of the left hand. The left hand is the hand most reluctant to reach out and act. The right

hand is associated with assertiveness and strength. In chapter 42 Lao Tzu writes:

What others have taught, I also teach:
Those who are violent do not die naturally.
I will make this my chief teaching. 3

During the Third century BC, when Lao Tzu wrote, war between feudal states was endemic. One reason was the lack of order imposed by a central political authority. Chinese philosophers such as Hui Shih, Kung-sun Lung, Yin Wen and Sung K'eng were known as pacifists. Sung K'eng, for example, "proposed disarmament in order to save" his contemporary society "from war."⁵

Lao Tzu, however, did not advocate pacifism. He did counsel against glorifying in war and combat. Chapter 57 counsels "direct the military with surprise tactics" but warns "too many sharp weapons among people and the nation grows confused."⁶ "Skillful fighters do not feel anger," says Lao Tzu, in chapter 68 "a skillful master does not engage the opponent."⁷

In chapter 69 Lao Tzu laments the familiar pattern of escalation between combatants and states that the side so evolved that it experiences grief over the conflict will be the victor:

The strategists have a saying:
"I dare not act as a host,
Yet I act as a guest.
I dare not advance an inch,
Yet I retreat a foot."

This is called
Traveling without moving,
Rising up without arms,
Projecting without resistance,

Capturing without strategies.

No misfortune is greater than underestimating
resistance;

Understanding resistance will destroy my
Treasures.

Thus when mutually opposing strategies escalate,
The one who feels sorrow will triumph. 8

To Lao Tzu war is a result of an imbalance between yin and yang. It stems from failing to live in harmony with the Tao. "When the world possesses the Tao even fast horses are used for their dung," said Lao Tzu, "When the world is without the Tao, War-Horses are raised in the suburbs." War is⁹ regrettable, but a reality in a less than perfect world. When it must be used, force should be motivated by defense only and governed by principles consistent with the Tao. Only self-defense was just and Taoist.

Confucius and Confucianism

Confucius (551-479 BC), although he was a member of the knightly class, also looked upon war as the final option to be exercised after all others have failed. He believed that, regrettably, there are times when force must be used by moral people to prevent enslavement by those for whom force is the only argument and sanction. To Confucius force was a last¹⁰ resort always subordinate to justice.

In his writings on military philosophy Confucius believed that the qualities of chivalry were required for leaders of the martial arts.¹¹ Virtue, preparedness, caution and careful planning were the characteristics of the "gentleman warrior".

Confucius believed virtue to be even more important than food for the troops and military readiness. In Book 12,

chapter 7 of The Analects of Confucius it is recorded:

Tzu-kung asked about government. The Master said, "sufficient food, sufficient weapons, and the confidence of the common people." Tzu-kung said, "Suppose you had no choice but to dispense with one of these three, which would you forgo?" The Master said, "Weapons." Tzu-kung said, "Suppose you were forced to dispense with one of the two that were left, which would you forgo?" The Master said, "Food. For from old death has been the lot of all men; but a people that no longer trusts its rulers is lost indeed." 12

The writings of Confucius also stress military readiness. Not only is he concerned about logistics and tactics, but the training of soldiers and popular support for the military effort.¹³ Confucius considered it unjust to send soldiers into battle without proper education and training. In Analects Book 13, chapter 29 he says military leaders who are "followers of the Way (Tao)" should train their forces seven years before employment in combat:

The Master said, Only when men of the right sort have instructed a people for seven years ought there to be any talk of engaging them in warfare. The Master said, To lead into battle a people that has not first been instructed is to betray them. 14

In stressing military readiness Confucius believed that waging war with preparedness and strategic planning was as foolish as attacking a tiger unarmed or crossing a river without a boat.

Analects Book 7, chapter 10 says:

The Master said to Yen Hui, "The maxim

'When wanted, then go;
When set aside; then hide.'

is one that you and I could certainly fulfill." Tzu-lu said, "Supposing you had command of the Three

Hosts, whom would you take to help you?" The Master said, "The man who was ready to 'beard a tiger or rush a river' without caring whether he lived or died-that sort of man I should not take. I should certainly take someone who approached difficulties with due caution and who preferred to succeed by strategy." 15

Like Lao Tzu, Confucius believed that war resulted from a failure to adhere to the highest spiritual and moral values. War happened when peace was not sought effectively and purposefully. The Confucian formula for peace was based on observance of benevolence, filial piety and righteousness.¹⁶ Tranquility results from practicing these three principles:

Benevolence is the tranquil habitation of man, and righteousness is his straight path. If each man love his parents and show due respect to his elders, the whole empire would enjoy tranquility. 17

Confucius does believe that war is justifiable for another reason other than self-defense. Humanitarian intervention by one nation to rescue citizenry oppressed by an evil tyrant in another nation is acceptable to him. Mencius, the greatest Confucianist after Confucius, also shared this view. Actual humanitarian interest, not territorial expansion, must be the true motivation. Confucius considers this not to be war, but proper punishment, as when he asked the Duke Ai of Lu to chastise an evil rebel in Analects Book 14, chapter 22:

When Ch'en Heng assassinated Duke Chien of Ch'i, Master K'ung washed his head and limbs, went to Court and informed Duke Ai of Lu, saying, "Ch'en Heng has slain his prince. I petition that steps should be taken to punish him." The Duke said, "You had better inform the Three." Master K'ung said, "As I rank next to the Great Officers, I could not do otherwise than lay this information before you. And now your Highness says 'Inform the Thre'e?' He

then went to the Three and informed them. They refused his petition. Master K'ung said, "As I rank next to the Great Officers, I could not do otherwise than lay this petition before you." 18

In the philosophy of Confucius, war is a last resort governed by rules of engagement centered on restraint, prudence and moral example. However, force may be used not only in self-defense, but, unlike in the Taoist views of Lao Tzu, war is justified in punishing an evil ruler and rescuing that oppressed nation from tyranny. War, according to Confucius requires good government, the support of the people, effective and moral military forces and just cause.

Mo Tzu and Moism

Mo Tzu is considered by many to be the most articulate opponent of war in ancient China. In his writings composed around the Fourth Century BC, he attacked war on both economic and moral grounds.

Mo Tzu's first critique of war was economic. War was unprofitable and wasteful of economic, human and natural resources. The cost was high even for the victor. "When we consider victory as such there is nothing useful about it," he said, "When we consider the possessions obtained throughout it, they do not even make up for the loss." 19

The greatest evil to Mo Tzu was predatory warfare of larger nations against smaller nations. One reason for this was his association with, and possible birth in, the small state of Sung. Wars between larger neighbors often took place with Sung territory as the battleground. 20

In his essay, "On Aggressive War" in the Mo Tzu, the book of writings which bears his name, the Chinese philosopher counters the argument that wars of conquest were beneficial to China because they created four unified states out of many divided small states:

You have failed to examine the terminology I employ and do not understand the reasoning behind it. In ancient times the Son of Heaven ruled over ten thousand feudal lords. And yet now, because of the annexation of one state by another, these ten thousand domains have all disappeared and only the four remain. But it is rather like the case of a doctor who administers medicine to over ten thousand patients but succeeds in curing only four. He cannot be said to be a very skilled physician.

Yet these rulers who delight in offensive warfare attempt once more to put a pleasing facade upon their doctrines. 21

Mo Tzu consistently asserted that war was more destructive than constructive for both the victor and the vanquished. He compared conquerors who wage war merely for the love of conquest to great thieves suffering from
22
kleptomania.

In addition to economic critique, Mo Tzu developed moral objections to war based on spiritual ideas and the value of human life. In one passage of "On Aggressive War" he combines the economic and moral arguments by painting a grim picture of the wasteful nature of war:

When a state which delights in aggressive warfare raises an army, it must have several hundred high officers, several thousand regular officers, and a hundred thousand soldiers, before it can set out. The time required for the expedition will be several years at the longest, several months at the least. During that time the leaders will have no time to attend to affairs of government, the officials no time to manage their departments of

state, the farmers no time to sow or reap, the women no time to spin or weave. So in this case too the state will lose its fighting men and the common people will be forced to abandon their occupations. Moreover, there will be the damage and depreciation to the horses and chariots to consider, while if one fifth of the tents and hangings, army supplies, and weapons can be salvaged from the campaign, the state will be lucky. In addition, a countless number of men will desert or become lost along the way, or will die and end tumbled in a ditch due to the starvation, cold and sickness caused by the length of the journey or the fact that supplies do not arrive in time.

Such is the injury which warfare inflicts upon men, the harm it brings to the world. And yet the rulers and officials delight in carrying out such expeditions. In effect they are taking delight in the injury and extermination of the people of the world. Are they not perverse?

Also immoral in Mo Tzu's view is to motivate military forces by fear rather than good government and moral leadership. Describing this "rule by fear" he says:

The soldiers are urged forward into battle by being told, "To die in the cause of duty is the highest honor, to kill a large number of the enemy is the next highest, and to be wounded is next. But as for breaking ranks and fleeing in defeat-the penalty for that is death without hope of pardon!" So the soldiers are filled with fear. 23

Despite his general opposition to war, and his distrust of using force for economic gain, political prestige, territorial expansion and "serving the will of Heaven," Mo Tzu did develop a concept of just war. In "On Aggressive War" he makes a distinction between a state or ruler using force to
24
"punish" rather than "attack." In the just war concepts of Mo Tzu the following uses of force were acceptable:

- (a) Defensive warfare against aggression
- (b) arming the weak for deterrence or defense against the strong
- (c) Overthrowing an evil ruler
- (d) Putting down evil rebels 25

In chapter 68 of the Mo Tzu there is a religious rite for defensive war which calls for animal sacrifice, soothsayers, shamans, herbs and inspectors of cloud vapors. I have included the ritual as appendix one of this paper.

Like Lao Tzu and Confucius, Mo Tzu essentially viewed war as a necessary evil to be opposed for other than defensive purposes. High moral values and ethical military leadership are requirements for using force in a just cause.

Sun Tzu and The Art of War

In recent years, people in the armed forces, the business world and the government have (re-) discovered a manual on planning and executing military operations written over 2,000 years ago. The Art of War by Sun Tzu has even been quoted recently in a major motion picture Wall Street.

Although little is known about Sun Tzu, he is believed to have lived around 400 BCE. He is called "the divine doctor"²⁶ of Confucian military thought. His approach to war as an art that can be mastered and practiced certainly reflects the values of Confucianism and Taoism.

As already seen Confucianism, Taoism and other Chinese religions and philosophies preferred that victory in war be obtained with a minimum of loss of life, property and resources. The theories of war presented by Sun Tzu reflect these concerns. "War is a grave matter," says Sun Tzu, "one²⁷ is apprehensive lest men embark on it without reflection."

Protracted conflict was to be avoided because of its wasteful nature. According to Sun Tzu:

Victory is the main object in war. If this is long delayed, weapons are blunted and morale depressed. When the army engages in protracted campaigns the resources of the state will not suffice. For there has never been a protracted war from which a country has benefitted. 28

In Sun Tzu's Confucian and Taoist way of thinking the best way to win a victory is to win without fighting. Force is a precious commodity that is easily squandered. It must always be used effectively and sparingly. How does one win by minimum use of force? In his Art of War Sun Tzu stresses intelligence, espionage, deception, spirituality, grand strategy and conservative military tactics. War, to be just, must be limited.

Sun Tzu's "limited war" strategy involved, like Lao Tzu, Confucius and Mo Tzu, that ever present Chinese quality of prudence. One engages in battle only when odds are overwhelmingly in your favor. Attrition warfare and siege of cities are to be avoided because of their costly and protracted nature. Utilize diplomacy, when possible, to isolate your enemy before the use of force. The best one can do is attack your enemy's strategy in a way to frustrate every move the foe makes.

If one must fight, Sun Tzu believes, utilize mobility, flexibility, deception and surprise. Aim to confuse, demoralize and frustrate the enemy and create disorder in the

ranks of the adversary. Once disorder is created you are in control of the situation.

Sun Tzu's military philosophy is rooted in his religious views of the universe.²⁹ His beliefs about harmony/disharmony, strength/weakness, direct warfare/indirect warfare and so on originate in the yin-yang concept of Taoism and other Chinese spiritual paths. If one believes harmony is the essence of the universe it makes sense that one can defeat an enemy if disharmony can be brought upon him.

In the martial view of Sun Tzu war indeed is an art that can brought in line with the will of Heaven itself. "Those skillful in war cultivate the Tao," says Sun Tzu, "and preserve the laws and are therefore able to formulate victorious policies."³⁰

Military leadership described in The Art of War Sun demands qualities like humanity, justice, courage, wisdom, boldness, stamina and craftiness. The general, according to Sun Tzu, must embody great attributes:

It is the business of the general to be serene and inscrutable, impartial and self-controlled. If he is serene, he is not released; if inscrutable, unfathomable; if upright, not improper; if self-controlled, not confused. 31

Like Lao Tzu, Confucius and Mo Tzu, Sun Tzu was concerned about conducting war without a glorification of violence or seeking violence for its own sake. For Sun Tzu, military leadership involved spiritual sensitivity and ethical codes based on the highest moral values of Chinese religion and philosophy. However in our final Chinese thinker we will see

a view of war different than the jus ad bello and jus ad bellum concerns of the previous four.

Shang Yang and Legalism

As we have seen so far, Chinese philosophers, and even a master of the military arts like Sun Tzu, considered warfare, violence and bloodshed was something to be minimized or avoided altogether. However, this was not a unanimous opinion among the intellectual, cultural and political thought of ancient China. One school of Chinese philosophy, known as Legalism, advocated absolute authority for the ruler and the state. Legalists believed the thought of Mo Tzu and Confucius had corrupted the people with expectations that the government existed for them rather than for the sovereign and the state. Since the ruler and the state must maintain or expand their authority by violence in many circumstances the Legalist³² "considered war to be man's natural destiny."

The Legalist thinker considered "perhaps the most important and by all odds the most interesting" is Shang Yang,³³ an official of the state of Ch'in, who died in 338 BC. Ch'in was the state where Legalism was most prevalent. A work called The Book of Lord Shang, supposedly written by him, is a "scripture" of Legalism.

Power and force, to the Legalist, were the only things that really mattered in the world. Waging war was a natural, acceptable and necessary part of political life. The Book of Lord Shang laments that the people disliked war, but proposed a practical, but cruel, remedy. The ruler is counseled to

make the people's everyday life so hard that they will welcome war as a release from it. Shang Yang states:

Now, former kings were able to make their people tread on naked swords, face showers of arrows and stones, was it because the people liked doing it? Not at all; but they had learned that by doing so they escaped from even worse harm. Therefore I would have told the people, if they fear harm, it will only be by fighting that they escape it. 34

While Mo Tzu, Lao Tzu, Confucius, Mo Tzu and Sun Tzu advocated such values as goodness, respect for elders, morality and peace, Shang Yang condemned these values as promoting decay of the power of the ruler and the state. Shang Yang said these values produced a situation where "the ruler will not promote warfare, with the result that he will become impoverished and his territory diminished." 35

Instead of appeals to moral virtues and spiritual values, Shang Yang counsels ruthlessness and the glorification of violence and war. He advises the ruler:

Concentrate the people upon warfare, and they will be brave; let them care about other things and they become cowardly. A people that looks to warfare as a ravenous wolf looks at a piece of meat is a people that can be used. 36

Shang Yang's ideal world was in stark contrast to the visions of the four previous Chinese religious leaders and philosophers. Lao Tzu envisioned a world living in balanced harmony between nature, humanity, the individual and the Tao. Confucius desired a social order based on benevolence, filial piety and righteousness. Mo Tzu envisioned a world governed by all-embracing universal love which moved beyond loving only family and leadership. Shang Yang's ideal society, however,

was the "country that is really strong" possessing a spirit of
militarism rooted in the willingness to engage in combat.³⁷

He stated:

A ruler who can make the people delight in war will become king of kings. In a country that is really strong the father will send his son, the elder brother his younger brother, the wife her husband, all saying as they speed him: "Conquer, or let me never see you again!" If the only gate to riches and honor is battle, then when the people hear that there is war they will congratulate one another, at home and in the streets, at their eating and at their drinking, all the songs they sing will be of war. 38

In clear contrast to the philosophers we have already discussed, Shang Yang, and the Legalist way of thinking, views war as a glorious experience to be encouraged, nurtured and freely practiced. A just cause for using force is not a concern. Military leadership in this sense requires a totalitarian, rather than moral, sense. The leader, or ruler, in Legalism must be ruthless, dictatorial, unerring, cruel and absolutely powerful. The interest is not in spiritual, ethical or moral values, but only the possession, execution and expansion economic and political power for the sake of the ruler and the service of the state.

In summary, Chinese religion and philosophy, with the exception of Shang Yang and Legalism, considered the use of force disruptive of the harmony essential to spiritual, social
39
and individual life. When conducted, if it had to be conducted at all, it was to be governed by moral principles which would result in minimum abuse of power, limited use of force, the pursuit of just causes and minimized loss of human

life, property and national resources. To the ancient philosophers of China that placed moral responsibility on military commanders humanitarian intervention, chastisement of wicked rulers or rebels, self-defense or harmony with the Tao are the requisites for just war.

Chapter III Endnotes

1. Arthur F. Wright, Studies in Chinese Thought, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1953, p. 51.
2. R. L. Wing (translator) The Tao of Power, Doubleday Press, New York, 1986, p. 86
3. Ibid, p. 108.
4. Wright, op.cit., p. 52.
5. Ibid.
6. Wing, op.cit., p. 138.
7. Ibid, p. 161.
8. Ibid, p. 163.
9. Ibid, p. 117.
10. H. D. Creel, Chinese Thought from Confucius to Mao Tse Tung, New American Library, New York, 1953, p. 30.
11. Chang Chi-yun, Confucianism : A Modern Interpretation, Hwa Kang Press, Taiwan, 1980, pp. 292-294.
12. Arthur Waley (translator), The Analects of Confucius, Vintage Books, New York, 1938, p. 163.
13. Chi-yun, op.cit., p. 292.
14. Waley, op.cit., pp. 178-179.
15. Ibid, pp. 124-125.
16. Theodore T. Y. Yen, Confucianism, Christianity and China, Philosophical Library, New York, 1969, p. 151.
17. Ibid.
18. Waley, op.cit., p. 186.
19. Wright, op.cit., p. 52.
20. Creel, op.cit., p. 51.

21. Burton Watson (translator), Basic Writings of Mo Tzu, Hsun Tzu and Han Fei Tzu, Columbia University Press, New York, 1967, p. 59.
22. Creel, op.cit., p. 52.
23. Watson, op.cit., p. 53.
24. Ibid, p. 56 and p. 58.
25. Wright, op.cit., p. 52.
26. James A. Aho, Religious Mythology and the Art of War, Greenwood Press, Westport, Conn., 1981, p. 114.
27. Samuel B. Griffith (translator), Sun Tzu : The Art of War, Oxford University Press, New York, 1971, p. 63.
28. Ibid, p. 73.
29. Arthur Waldron, "Sun Tzu", Lecture. Naval War College, 28 August 1989.
30. Griffith, op.cit., p. 88.
31. Ibid, p. 136.
32. Creel, op.cit., p. 117.
33. Ibid, p. 119.
34. Arthur Waley, Three Ways of Thought in China, Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA, 1982, p. 166.
35. Ibid, p. 168.
36. Ibid.
37. Ibid.
38. Ibid.
39. Interview with Ted Kardesh, 19 April 1990 (see Appendix III)

Chapter IV

Hinduism

The Aryan Origins of Hinduism

Hinduism encompasses many diverse religious movements¹ within its theological umbrella. The origins of Hinduism are rooted in the violent migrations of Indo-Europeans or Aryans discussed in Chapter II. The Aryan tribes which invaded India around 1500 BC brought with them a body of polytheistic religious beliefs already well developed. The Aryan religion merged with the beliefs and practices of the conquered Indus civilization of the indigenous Dravidians. The resulted merger of Dravidian high culture, with its Mother Goddess worship, and Aryan war culture produced the complex religion² and mythology which became Hinduism.

The Aryans were divided into tribes, each headed by a military chieftain. This chieftain is called a rajan in Sanskrit, a rex in Latin and a rig-yo in Celtic.³ As already mentioned in Chapter II, the people who called themselves "Aryas" were the ancestors of the Persians, Teutons, Celts, Greeks, Latins and Hittites.⁴ The name "Arya" survives in modern time in the states "Iran" and "Ireland."⁵

The era of earliest Aryan dominance over India has been pieced together through study of their religious "Books of Knowledge" or Vedas. A reflection of oral traditions, the Vedas are the world's earliest surviving Indo-European⁶ literature. The oldest and most important of the four Vedas is the Rig-Veda.

It is a collection of 1017 hymns which the other three Vedas⁷ borrow from extensively. The Atharva-Veda consists mainly of spells meant for the practice of magic. The Sama-Veda is concerned primarily with sacrifices by priests. The Yajur-Veda is made up of ritual formulas to be used for priestly sacrifice.

Written in a later period, the Brahmanas and Sutas are theological treatises or commentaries on Vedic ritual. Unlike the earlier Vedas, the mythology of the Brahmanas recognizes a father-god as the chief of all deities. Later still are the Upanisads which represent a different religious tradition of reincarnation and transmigration. The emphasis on the father-god in the Brahmanas is replaced with the fundamental doctrine of the world-soul and its relationship to individual soul. Unlike the previous literature, the Upanisads is concerned with release from the cycle of rebirth by union with the world-soul, rather than obtaining earthly and heavenly happiness by properly sacrificing to the gods and goddesses.

The four major castes or social classes in Hindu law appearing in the tenth and final section of the Rig-Veda, the "Sacrifice of Cosmic Man," reflect the Aryan preference for hierarchy. These are:

- (a) The brahmans who exercise spiritual power and who issued from the mouth of the original cosmic man.
- (b) The kshatriyas who exercise secular and military power and issued from the arms.
- (c) The vaishyas who exercise professional skills, such as

artisans and cultivators, and who issued from the thighs.

(d) The shudras or untouchables who constitute the majority⁸ of society and who issued from the feet.

According to Hinduism one is born into one's social class for the purpose of fulfilling one's divinely-ordained mission⁹ or karmic duty. Adherence to karmic duty allows reincarnation on a higher social and spiritual plane in the next human life. It is with the kshatriyas, and the role assigned them in the Vedic scriptures that one finds the issues relevant to a study of religion and war.

The Kshatriya, War and the Scriptures

The early Vedic scriptures are called "Great Epics" which combine tales of battle with ethical and moral principles. The Rig-Veda, though not detailing the great Indo-European migrations from southern Russian or the Aryan invasion of India around 1500 BC, does mention Aryan victories against darker-skinned peoples (indigenous Dravadians later enslaved) manning "fortified places." A later epic consisting of 100,000 couplets, the Mahabharata, is the story of the fratricidal conflict between the Pandaras and Kauravas, and their interminable battles. It, like the Iliad, contains warlike narratives mixed with moral discourses and mythological stories. The Bhagavad-Gita, in English "The Song of the Lord," is taken from the middle part of the Mahabharata. It tells of a battle in which millions are killed. The central figures are Krishna, the god who reveals himself as the Surpeme Creator, Yudhishtira, the King of

Righteousness and Arjuna, Yudhishtira's younger brother. The Bhagavad-Gita opens with Arjuna having a spontaneous attack of conscientious objection when confronted with the reality of leading his brother's military forces against relatives numbered among the enemy. The dialogue between Krishna and Arjuna reveals the war-ethic of the Aryan peoples which influenced Hinduism. On one hand Arjuna feels the need to fulfill his karmic duty as a warrior. On the other hand Arjuna refuses to fight feeling compassion for his relatives among his foes. Selected verses from chapter I highlight Arjuna's ethical dilemma:

Arjuna saw standing there fathers and grandfathers, teachers, uncles, brothers, sons and grandsons, and also companions;

And fathers-in-law and friends in both the armies. Seeing all these kinsmen thus arrayed, the son of Kunti (Arjuna),

Filled with the utmost compassion, sorrowfully spoke: "Seeing my own kinsmen, O Krishna, arrayed and wishing to fight,

My limbs collapse, my mouth dries up, there is trembling in my body and my hair stands on end;

The bow slips from my hand and my skin also is burning; I am not able to stand still, my mind is whirling.

And I see evil portents, O Krishna and I foresee no good in slaying my own kinsmen in the fight.

I do not desire victory, O Krishna, nor kingdom, nor pleasure. Of what use is kingdom to us, O Govinda (Krishna), of what use pleasure or life?

Teachers, fathers, sons, and also grandfathers; uncles, fathers-in-law, grandsons, brothers-in-law and (other) kinsmen:

These I do not wish to kill, though they kill, me O Krishna, even for the kingdom of the three worlds; how (much less) then for the sake of the earth!

What pleasure can be course, O Krishna in slaying the sons of Dhritarashtra?

Therefore we should not slay the sons Dhritarashtra, our kinsmen. How could we be happy

killing our own people, O Madhava?

Alas, what a great sin we resolved to commit in undertaking to kill our own people through our greed for the pleasures of kingdom."

The mighty Arjuna, having thus addressed Krishna, said to Krishna, "I will not fight," and fell silent. 10

Krishna, in his response to Arjuna, calls the warrior's concerns "unmanly," "un-Aryan," "unbecoming" "petty weaknesses of the heart" and a course that "does not lead to heaven" and on earth "leads to disgrace." Arjuna is counseled by Krishna to carry on his karmic duty as a warrior because:

(a) The soul is not slain, but sheds a body at death and takes on a new body at birth. Thus those slain will be reborn and if Arjuna is slain he will be reborn.

(b) Duty of this life must be fulfilled. There is no greater cosmic good than for a warrior to do his karmic duty and fight for goodness.

(c) The warrior who fulfills his karmic duty will receive all the blessings of the good karma his actions bring.

Thus the warrior obligation of the kshatriya caste receives not only a religious reinforcement of the system from the Bhagavad-Gita, but a reassurance that merely performing their duties with devotion to Krishna will bring good karma and ultimate salvation. Arjuna is urged by Krishna to abandon his sentiments voiced so far:

Thou grieveest for those thou shouldst not grieve for, and yet thou speakest words that sound like wisdom. Wise men do not mourn for the dead or for the living. As the soul in this body passes through childhood, youth and old age, so (after departure from this body) it passes on to another body. The sage is not bewildered by this.

It is said that (only) these bodies of the

eternal embodied (soul), which is indestructible and incomprehensible, are perishable. Therefore fight, O Bharata (Arjuna)!

He who thinks that this (soul) is a slayer, and he who thinks that this (soul) is slain; both of them are ignorant. This (soul) neither slays nor is slain.

It is never born, nor does it die, nor having once been, will it again cease to be. It is unborn, eternal and everlasting. This primeval one is not slain when the body is slain.

He who knows that it (the soul) is indestructible and eternal, unborn and unchanging, how can that man slay, O Arjuna, or cause another to slay? 11

In his sermon to Arjuna, Krishna challenges him to fulfill his cosmic destiny as a kshatriya and go forth and do battle:

Further, having regard for thine own dharma, thou shouldst not tremble. There exists no greater good for a Kshatriya than a battle required by duty.

Happy are the Kshatriyas, O Arjuna, for whom such a battle comes by mere chance, opening the door to heaven.

But if thou wilt not wage this righteous battle, then having thrown away thy duty and glory, thou wilt incur sin.

Besides, men will forever speak of thy dishonor, and for one who has been honored, dishonor is worse than death.

The great warriors will think that thou hast abstained from battle because of fear and they who highly esteemed thee will think lightly of thee.

Many words which ought not to be spoken will be spoken by thy enemies, scorning thy strength. What is more painful than that?

If thou are slain, thou wilt obtain heaven, or if thou conquer, thou wilt enjoy the earth. Therefore arise, O son of Kunti, resolved to fight.

Regarding alike pleasure and pain, gain and loss, victory and defeat, prepare thyself for battle. Thus thou wilt not incur sin. Thou shalt cast away the bondage of karma.

Better one's own dharma, though imperfect, than another's well performed. Better death in (the fulfillment of) one's own law, for another's law is dangerous.

Thus having known that which is greater than the reason, steadying the self by the self, slay the enemy, O mighty-armed one!

Time and I, the world destroyer, matured, come forth to subdue the worlds here. Even without thee, all the warriors arrayed in the opposing armies shall cease to be.

Therefore stand up and win fame. Conquering thy enemies, enjoy a prosperous kingdom. By Me they have already been slain. Be thou the mere instrument, O Savyasacin.

Slay thou Drona, Bhishma, Jayadratha, Karna, and the other warrior-heroes too, who have already been slain by Me. Be not distressed, fight! Thou shalt conquer thy enemies in battle. 12

Consistent with the warrior ethic espoused by Krishna in the Bhagavad-Gita, the kshatriya is taught by Hinduism that his caste profession maintains cosmic order through violent practice of war called "the eternal law of kings." Hindu law of warfare defines the weapons and conduct of combat for the kshatriya. The warrior is counseled that it is a sin to die in anything else but battle:

Death on a bed of repose, after ejecting phlegm and urine and uttering piteous cries, is sinful for a kshatriya....The death of a kshatriya, O sire, at home is not praiseworthy....Surrounded by kinsmen and slaughtering his foes in battle, a kshatriya should die at the edge of keen weapons. 13

The kshatriya, fighting for his raja (king) and goodness, maintains both the social order of the caste system and the cosmic order of sacred law. Failure to maintain order would bring on the Sanskrit term "matsyanyaya," "the way of the fishes," in which the victorious wicked would "roast the weak like fish on a spit." Although Hinduism inspired the kshatriya to oppose and destroy his foe, safeguards existed to protect civilians and non-combatants. Around 300 BC Megasthenes, the Greek ambassador to the Mauryan empire in India wrote on this ethic saying:

At the very time when a battle was going on, the neighboring cultivators might be seen quietly cultivating their work, perhaps ploughing, gathering in their crops, pruning trees, or reaping the harvest. ¹⁷

Contemporary Hinduism and the Use of Force

Religion, as in ancient times, has been a factor in the political life of India in recent history. Prior to independence, Indian nationalism and Hindu revivalism were inter-related. ¹⁸ One Hindu Indian nationalist leader, Aurobindo Ghose, taught that love for God and love for "the Motherhood of God" embodied in India were one and the same. ¹⁹ In 1909 he spoke of how Krishna visited him in jail and assured the independence activist that the god was incarnate in the nationalist movement. ²⁰

Mohandas Gandhi utilized Hindu concepts while emphasized Muslim-Hindu unity in his leadership of the independence drive. While he read from the Bhagavad-Gita, New Testament and Koran in his daily prayer meetings, Gandhi focused on the Hindu ideas of "ahimsa" or noninjury and "satyagraha," the force born of truth, as the basis for his nonviolent resistance to British colonialism. ²¹

Gandhi's commitment to nonviolence did have exceptions. He accepted the necessity of killing vermin and tigers threatening villages, mercy-killing of suffering animals and humans, taking life for food and self-defense against a murderer running amok. ²² In 1920 Gandhi wrote on the choice between cowardice and violence for India saying:

I would rather have India resort to arms in order to defend her honor, than that she should in a cowardly

manner become or remain a helpless witness to her own dishonor. 23

Religion caused problems in India that consistently tore at the political fabric of the nation. Inability to settle religious conflicts led to the partition of the sub-continent into two independent states, predominantly Muslim Pakistan and predominantly Hindu India, in 1947. Gandhi was himself assassinated by a member of the Mahasabha, a Hindu religious-political group. 24

In writing on the divisive role of religion in Indian society, Jawaharlal Nehru, the nation's first prime minister once said:

India is supposed to be a religious country above everything else. Hindu, Moslem and Sikh take pride in their faiths and testify to the truth by breaking their heads. The spectacle of what is called religion, in India and elsewhere, has filled me with horror, and I have frequently condemned it and wished to sweep clean of it. Almost always it seemed to stand for blind reaction, dogma and bigotry, superstition and exploitation, and the preservation of vested interests. 25

Since 1947 India and Pakistan have fought 3 wars. 26
Tension continues over the disrupted territory of Kashmir. India is a nuclear power and Pakistan is seeking to become one if it is not a secret one already. Despite attempts by Prime Minister Bhutto and former Prime Minister Gandhi to reduce tensions by talks held in 1989, the potential for armed conflict still exists.

Motivated by a desire to defend its 200 mile exclusive economic zone, and its sea lanes for trade, as well as jolted by the diplomacy of force of a US aircraft carrier task force

off its shores during the Bangladesh crisis, India has begun a program to become a credible naval power in addition to being a regional power.²⁷ Currently the Indian Navy has 14 submarines and at least 4 on order. As Admiral S. N. Kohli of the Indian Navy commented:

India cannot be content to have nuclear submarines of other powers prowling around the Indian Ocean and not be able to deter them in any way. The presence of an Indian attack submarine would make them think twice before undertaking such a deployment. 28

Religious and ethnic strife is still a political factor in Indian domestic politics. In October and November of 1989 400 people were killed in riots between Hindus and Muslims in northern India.²⁹ These riots were sparked by a militant Hindu organization's announced plans to pull down a mosque under construction in a site sacred to Hindus and put up a temple instead. The group has since abandoned its decision and will build a temple alongside the mosque. In the present coalition government of India lead by Prime Minister V. P. Singh, the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP), a Hindu revivalist party holds 88³⁰ seats in the 529 member house. A militarily powerful India governed by a militant Hindu government could be a regional (or global) concern in the future. Such an India might try to make the Indian ocean even "more Indian" by, for example, seeking to enforce a nuclear-free zone in part of the Indian Ocean with its naval power.

Despite what Hindu militants in India may be willing to use force for, the majority of Hindus in America, most of whom

follow a form of the Krishna religion within Hinduism are not inspired to resurrect the martial culture of the kshatriya in the ways expressed in the Vedic scriptures. When asked about the use of force members of the International Society for Krishna Consciousness (ISKCN), or Hare Krishnas, expressed the following views which are covered in detail in Appendix IV:

- (a) Although peace is the ideal, nations have a right and obligation to maintain militaries for self-defense.
- (b) Military force should be used only for self-defense and the protection of freedoms such as religious freedom.
- (c) The use of force should include safeguards to protect the lives of non-combatants, animals and plants.
- (d) The use of force should not include aggression, oppression and suppression of a nation's own citizens.
- (e) Military values such as sacrifice and discipline are³¹ directly related to moral qualities of the spiritual life.

In summary, Hinduism as a historical religion incorporates in the Vedic scriptures, an ethic of duty that easily translates into a justification for the use of force. The revival of Hinduism, and the use of violence by militant proponents of Hinduism within Indian society, could pose regional, or even global, concerns if ever combined with the military and naval buildup of India and thrust on to the international arena.

Fundamentalist religion of any kind united with political and³² military power could pose a threat to regional stability.

However, part of the Hindu religious universe, along with the

ethical obligation of the kshatriya is the tradition of ahimsa and satyagraha embodied in Gandhi and scriptural and religious constraints on the protection of non-combatants, animals and the environment. This seems particularly true among American Hindus. Although the mandate to wage war is clear in Hinduism, the expectation is that the use of force will be governed by standards consistent with the highest principles of the faith.

Chapter IV Footnotes

1. Interview with Drutakarma, 20 April 1990 (see Appendix IV)
2. Louis Renou (editor), Hinduism (New York: George Braziller, 1962) p. 17.
3. James A. Aho, Religious Mythology and the Art of War (Westport, Conn: Greenwood, Press, 1981) p. 60.
4. Ibid.
5. Ibid.
6. Stanley Wolpert, A New History of India (Third Edition) (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989) p. 25.
7. "Vedic Religion," Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, 1966 ed., v. 12, p. 601.
8. Wolpert, op.cit., p. 29 and Renou, op.cit., pp. 52-53.
9. Interview with Drutakarma, op.cit.
10. Elliot Deutsch (translator), The Bhagavad-Gita (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968) pp. 32-33 and 39.
11. Ibid, pp. 31, 38, 39.
12. Ibid, pp. 40, 41, 51, 52, 53 and 98.
13. Aho, op.cit., p. 62.
14. Ibid, pp. 63-66.
15. Quoted in Ibid, p. 62.
16. Ibid, p. 73.
17. Quoted in Ibid, p. 68.
18. Guenter Lewy, Religion and Revolution (New York: Oxford University Press, 1974) pp. 277-322.
19. Ibid, p. 283.
20. Ibid.

21. Ibid, p. 298-299.
22. Ibid, p. 301.
23. Ibid.
24. Arthur S. Banks, ed., Political Handbook of the World: 1989
(Binghamton, New York: CSA Publications, 1989) p. 273.
25. Sumit Ganguly, The Origins of War in South Asia (Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1986) p. 25.
26. Salamat Ali in Muzaffarabad, "Line of Conflict," Far Eastern Economic Review, 10 May 1990, pp. 18-19.
27. Tai Ming Cheung, "Command of the Seas," Far Eastern Economic Review, 27 July 1989, pp. 16-18.
28. Ibid, p. 16.
29. "First Steps," The Economist, December 9, 1989, p. 30.
30. "The Odds Against V. P. Singh," The Economist, December 23, 1989, p. 37.
31. Drutakarma, op.cit.
32. Zara Dian, "Religion and National Security in Southeast Asia," Asian Defense Journal, December, 1989, p. 3.

CHAPTER V

BUDDHISM

The Basics of Buddhism

China is said to have "three ways," Taoism, confucianism and Buddhism. This is not only true of China. Thailand, Japan, China, Laos, Vietnam, India, Mongolia, Cambodia, Tibet, Burma, Korea, Nepal and Sri Lanka all have been influenced by the Buddhist religion.¹ Today, as with other major world religions, many schools of thought and practice exist within Buddhism. These include, among others, the Theravada, Mahayana, Amida, Nichiren, Tantric, Vajrayana, Zen, Lamaism, Tendai, Shingon and Soka Gakkai traditions. The various traditions reflect the cultural conditions of the nations in which they developed, like Tibet, China and Japan, as well as various differences in the strictness of doctrinal interpretations.

The founder of Buddhism was a prince from what is now Nepal, named Siddhartha Gautama. He was born about 560 BC and died at the age of eighty. In the early part of his life Gautama studied spirituality from many religious teachers. The key turning point in his life was the realization that the type of extreme asceticism he had practiced for about seven years was spiritually and morally futile. Gautama adopted more serene forms of meditation and practice and achieved "enlightenment." He then became a "Buddha" which means "awakened one," "enlightened one" or "aware one."² Gautama spent the rest of his life traveling, teaching, preaching and gathering

missionary disciples. He taught that all could achieve Buddha-hood or Buddha-nature as he did.

The three centers of Buddhist life are dharma (the teaching of the faith that leads to enlightenment), Buddha (the embodiment of the striving to achieve Buddha-nature), and sangha (the spiritual community of the faithful). Important concepts of Buddhism include:

(a) The Four Noble Truths: Suffering is the result of past karma; suffering is caused by desiring the wrong things or the right things in the wrong way; suffering can cease and the solution to suffering is the eightfold path.

(b) The Eightfold Path: Right knowledge and right attitude under the heading of wisdom and understanding; right speech, right action and right living (or right occupation) under the heading of ethical conduct and right effort, right mindfulness and right composure under the heading of mental discipline.

(c) Nirvana: A transformed mode of human consciousness and union with the dynamic power of the eternal and spiritual.

(d) Ideas like reincarnation, compassion, meditation, the interconnected nature of all things, enlightenment, tolerance, peace, nonviolence, reconciliation, pluralism, inner knowledge, non-attachment, and the emphasis on human dignity.³

Buddhism, as a religion, generally opposes the use of force, violence and war. In referring to the Chinese occupation of his homeland Tibet, the Dalai Lama, who is both spiritual leader and head of state, said:

Nobody can understand Tibet without some understanding of our religion. I am a steadfast

follower of the doctrine of nonviolence which was first preached by Lord Buddha, whose divine wisdom is absolute and infallible, and was practised in our own time by the Indian saint and leader Mahatma Gandhi. So from the very beginning I was strongly opposed to any resort to arms as a means of regaining our freedom. All my efforts through these years were spent in a search for a just and peaceful settlement with China, and I tried my best to discourage violence even at the risk of displeasing some of my own people. For nine years I managed to persuade those of my people who were still under the authority of the Tibetan government not to take to arms against the Chinese oppression, because I believed that course would be immoral and knew it would cause havoc on both sides. We Tibetans still have no feeling of hatred for the great Chinese people, although their representatives in Tibet have treated us so barbarously. Our only wish is to live our own lives in peace and friendship with all our neighbors, including the Chinese; but for that we appeal to all men and women all over the world who value tolerance and gentleness. 4

For his commitment to nonviolence social change and applying Buddhist principles to the cause of peace the Dalai Lama was awarded the 1989 Nobel Peace Prize. The selection committee stated:

The Dalai Lama has developed his philosophy of peace from a great reverence for all things living and upon the concept of universal responsibility for all mankind as well as nature. 5

These views of the Dalai Lama are consistent with the tenets of Buddhism. However, despite the emphasis on nonviolence, peace and reconciliation, throughout the history of Asia Buddhism was ignored, used or corrupted by political authorities. As one author commented:

On the question of war Buddhism said little, though a few passages in the Buddhist scripture oppose it. Like the historical Ashoka, the ideal emperor of Buddhism gains his victories by moral suasion. This did not prevent many Buddhist kings of India and Ceylon from becoming great conquerors and pursuing their political aims with much the same ruthlessness

as their Hindu neighbors. Two of pre-Muslim India's greatest conquerors, Harsha of Kanauj (606-647 AD) and Dharmapala of Bihar and Bengal (770-810 AD), were Buddhist. In fact Buddhism had little direct effect on the political order, except in the case of Ashoka, and its leaders seem often to have been rather submissive to the temporal power. An Erastian relationship between church and state is indicated in the inscriptions of Ashoka, and in Buddhist Ceylon the same relationship usually existed. 6

Ashoka (268-233 BC) used Buddhism to educate and inspire his people and enlighten his rule over the Maurya Empire. However, in later times Buddhism was used to support the use of force for political purposes by states and groups, despite the teachings against the taking of any life.

Buddhism and War

In practice the ideal of Buddhism often was corrupted by the self-serving ideology of the states, rulers or over-zealous practitioners. In ancient times the examples are many.

Sri Lanka, formerly Ceylon, has a tradition merging religion and nationalism that goes back to a period before the birth of Christ. The celebrated Buddhist king Dutthagamani who ruled in the Second Century BC, like the Indian monarchs Harsha of Kanauj and Dharmapala of Bihar and Bengal to come centuries later, was a warrior and a conqueror. Dutthagamani⁷ marched to war with a relic of Buddha as his banner in his battle lance and called upon a company of 500 monks to escort his troops to war.⁸ In doing so Dutthagamani sought divine protection for his soldiers and symbolized his use of force for the purpose of establishing order to spread Buddhist

principles within his kingdom in the same manner Buddhism⁹ conquers chaos. Buddhist monks enlisted in his cause, one¹⁰ even reaching the rank of general. Monks in Korea were enrolled by kings to battle enemies in the twelfth, fourteenth¹¹, sixteenth, and seventeenth centuries AD. Chinese Buddhist monks took part in rebellions, fought invaders and organized¹² military forces for the defense of their monasteries. In Tibet a monk assassinated a king, Glan Durma, who was hostile¹³ to Buddhism.

Generally Buddhism recognizes five justifications for the taking of human life. These are:

- (a) A Mahayana Mahaparinirvana Sutra Story of the Buddha in one of his former lives, who killed some Brahmin heretics for the purpose of defending the doctrine.
- (b) The idea that it is better to kill one to save many. One Buddhist story tells of the Buddha himself killing a bandit in order to save five hundred merchants.
- (c) The belief (similar to the dialogue between Krishna and Arjuna in the Bhagavad-Gita) that since existence is an illusion life and death similarly are illusions and the soul does not die when the body is killed.
- (d) The conviction that it is better to kill another than to allow that one to kill (similar to Gandhi's argument about the man running amok).
- (e) The claim by Nichiren, who founded a nationalist Buddhist sect in Thirteenth Century AD Japan, that since destiny is

predetermined it can not be sinful to put one to death, for it
is their fate. ¹⁴

The Buddhist who kills must be positively motivated by charity, compassion or thoughtlessness, not the negative emotions; otherwise these acts disturb inner peace or create bad karma. If absolutely necessary, do it, but do not rejoice in it. Buddhist advisors to kings, even in modern times, counsel that as the head of state the monarch must use force when required to defend the nation, the state and the faith. In 1910, for example, at the coronation of King Rama VI of Thailand the Buddhist Patriarch gave a sermon on the three ¹⁵ qualities needed for royal rule. The firsts, desire for righteousness, the king was congratulated for already possessing. The second, desire for the welfare of others, the king was assured he also already possessed and practiced. The third, the policy of governance, may involve the use of force. The Patriarch praised His Majesty for building up the Thai military forces and stated:

People who live in different countries in close neighbourhood must inevitably have disputes and quarrelse, either on account of territory, or of the rights of the subjects thereof, or of commercial rivalry, and so forth...Such being the case, each nation finds it necessary to orgainise some of its own citizens into a class whose duty it is to fight against its enemies. Defense against external foes is one of the policies of governance and is one that cannot be neglected. Wars must be prepared for even in time of peace, otherwise one would not be in time, and one would be in a disadvantageous position towards one's foe. The Buddha said: "As a town situated on the frontier must be prepared internally and externally, so too should you be prepared." Thailand, had enjoyed great prosperity because all her citizens used to be warriors. 16

Referring to the warrior class of ancient India, the Buddhist Patriarch reminded King Rama VI that the monarch was "the Chief Kshatriya of Thailand."

More recently a Thai Buddhist leader, Kitthiwuttho,¹⁷ engaged in "ideological holy war" with communism. He stated that Buddhism was intimately connected to the national security, social order and morality of Thailand and the Communist ideology was the personification of evil. When asked whether killing Communists would produce karmic demerit, Kitthiwuttho responded that it certainly would not and said:

I think we must do this (i.e., killing), even though we are Buddhist. But such killing is not the killing of persons (khon). Because whoever destroys the nation, religion and the monarchy is not a complete person, but mara (evil). Our intention must be not to kill people but to kill the Devil. It is the duty of all Thai. 18

Buddhism played a significant role in anti-colonial and nationalist sentiment in Burma during the Twentieth Century. One former monk, Saya San, was coronated "the Buddhist King" by his followers and led an armed rebellion which began 22¹⁹ December, 1930. A mixture of Folk Buddhism, nature religion and nationalism was utilized as the ideological rallying force. One appeal of Saya San to the Burmese people proclaimed:

Do away with the heathens, Oh Nats, so that our glorious Buddhist religion may prosper....Hark! Ye Brahmans and Nats, King of Brahmans, Defender of Buddhism, and others. We swear we will not ill treat, nor destroy either the life or the property of the people who are members of the associations affiliated to the G.C.B.A. (General Conference of Buddhist Associations) and the Galon Army as long as Burma does not attain freedom from the British yoke....May we overcome the heathens speedily and

may the arms and ammunition used by our heathen opponents and their servants turn into water or air or mis-fire and never attain their object. 20

The British eventually crushed the rebellion, which included thousands of insurgents, and captured Saya Saya. He was convicted of seditious treason, and after a series of unsuccessful appeals, executed on November 28, 1937. Buddhism continued to be a force in Burmese politics until independence in 1948 and after. After election to Prime Minister in 1960 U Nu fulfilled a campaign promise and established Buddhism as
21
the state religion of Burma.

The Religion of the Samurai

The religious traditions of Japan significantly
22
influenced the samurai class of warriors. The Shinto faith taught loyalty to the Emperor, reverence for ancestors, and love of the Japanese nation. Confucianism taught rules for social harmony including the obedience of juniors to seniors and the need for follows to treat each other as they would be treated. Buddhism taught development of the inner person. A "cult of death" which taught samurais that ritual suicide, "hari-kari" or "beppuku," was the only way to atone for serious failure was also prevalent. However, Zen became the
23
personal religion of the samurai.

The samurai search for inner life and the Bushido Code which formed their ethical framework were strongly influenced
24
by the Zen tradition in Buddhism. It was re-introduced to Japan by the monk Eisai in 1192 AD. The word "Zen" is a Japanese form of the Chinese term "ch'an" and the Sanskrit word

"dhyana." All three mean "meditation." The beliefs and practices of Zen appealed to the military culture or the samurai. These include: (a) Gaining spiritual insight to tell the "true" from the "false" in self and reality.

(b) The emphasis on discipline, self-control and meditation.

(c) Cultivation of intuitive faculties and mustering of inner strength.

(d) Mind-body-spirit unity balance and integration to live and act as a whole person.

(e) Preparation for facing death without fear

(f) Development of detachment and mindlessness to objectively²⁵ evaluate one's self and reality.

"In short," as one author wrote, "Zen provided a philosophical framework ideally suited to the samurai ideals²⁶ that developed in the eleventh century." The samurai were "brought up under the rigors of Zen" which inspired them to "put aside all worldly things" and "detach one's mind from the here and now of this world of impermanence" in the "quest for²⁷ enlightenment." The samurai retired to Zen temples for periods of reflection, meditation and preparation for²⁸ practicing their military profession. By the time of the Tokugawa period the relationship between Zen and the samurai had grown until it permeated the entire Japanese feudal culture. The values of justice, courage, benevolence, politeness, sincerity, veracity, honor, duty, education, self-control and marital skill with the sword present in the

Bushido Code grew from the fertile interaction between the
29
samurai and Zen.

It was believed by the samurai that one could not gain
mastery of the martial arts themselves without a thorough
30
knowledge of Zen. Thus archery, sword fighting, aikido,
karate, Jujitsu and the other martial arts were practiced as
Zen disciples as well as military skills. In his book Zen in
the Art of Archery the author, Eugen Herrigel, illustrates
this view while writing about one lesson with his archery
teacher in Japan:

Contenting himself with a few practice shots, the
Master went on to expound the "Great Doctrine" in
relation to the art of archery, and to adapt it to
the stage we had reached. Although he dealt in
mysterious images and dark comparisons, the
meagerest hints were sufficient for us to understand
what it was about. He dwelt longest on the "artless
art" which must be the goal of archery if it is to
reach perfection. "He who can shoot with the horn
of the hare and the hair of the tortoise, and can
hit the center without bow (horn) and arrow (hair),
he alone is Master in the highest sense of the word,
Master of the artless art. In deed, he is the
artless art itself and thus Master and No-Master in
one. At this point archery, considered as the
unmoved movement, the undanced dance, passes over
into Zen." 31

The union of the spiritual arts and the martial arts
became an integrated part of Japanese culture. In the period
before and during World War Two this would cause dire
consequences for Buddhism's vision of being a universal faith
embracing all sentient beings rather than merely a tribal or
national religion.

Buddhism and Japanese Militarism

From 1868 to 1945 the Japanese government guided the development of religious life through policy.³² The purpose was to create a theocracy with Shintoism as the national religion and the Emperor as the head of both church and state. In 1940 government efforts to have all Japanese citizens promote militarism, nationalism and expansionism through the Shinto religion increased. From 1941 until 1945 religion was the almost completely subservient handmaiden of the state. Although there were some Christians and Buddhists who hesitated to place the Shinto pantheon, the Sun Goddess and the Emperor above their personal faith or historical religion, most went along with the trinity of Shintoism, militarism and nationalism. Nichiren priests excelled at chauvinism. The Nichiren missionary goal of making "the entire world one great Buddha-land," and all people "Buddhist saints," was equated³³ with the expansion of Japanese hegemony by military power. Collections were taken at Buddhist temples for the purchase of airplanes for the war effort. Nationalistic movies were promoted by Buddhist organizations. The "way of the divinities" and "the imperial way" had forced the religions, including Buddhism, to take part in stirring up³⁴ nationalist zeal among the Japanese people. The language of the war effort freely used "God-talk" as an address by Hashimoto Kingoro shows. He borrows from the "white race's" past religious justification of imperialism in a Japanese version of "manifest destiny":

And if it is still protested that our actions in Manchuria were excessively violent, we may wish to ask the white race just which country it was that sent warships and troops to India, South Africa, and Australia and slaughtered innocent natives, bound their hands and feet with iron chains, lashed their backs with iron whips, proclaimed these territories as their own, and still continues to hold them to this very day?

They will invariably reply, these were all lands inhabited by untamed savages. These people did not know how to develop the abundant resources of their land for the benefit of mankind. Therefore it was the wish of God, who created heaven and earth for mankind, for us to develop these underdeveloped lands and to promote the happiness of mankind in their stead. God wills it.

This is quite a convenient argument for them. Let us take it at face value. Then there is another question that we must ask them.

Suppose that there is still on this earth lands endowed with abundant natural resources that have not been developed at all by the white race. Would it not then be God's will and the will of Providence that Japan go there and develop those resources for the benefit of mankind?

And there still remain many such lands on this earth. 35

The collaboration of Buddhism and Japanese imperialism before and during the Second World War caused a crisis for the faith that continues to this day. Buddhists in Japan continue to soul-search and are vigilant that the Buddha-dharma, or teaching of the religion, is not taken over by royal dharma or
36
the ideology of the state again. The missionary expansion of Japanese Buddhism into nations like the United States has also increased the universal character of the religion. Even the zealous Nichiren tradition has shed its nationalist fervor and taken on a more global, rather than exclusively Japanese, view of the world. In the US the Nichiren Shoshu of America is the most multi-cultural and multi-ethnic of the Buddhist

denominations. By contrast, the Buddhist Churches of America, the largest and the oldest of the US Buddhist denominations, remains predominantly Japanese.

In summary, Buddhism generally emphasizes peace, reconciliation and nonviolence. However, in both ancient and recent Asian history Buddhists have developed traditions that supported state ideology and the use of force not only in self-defense, but in wars of conquest like the campaigns of Dutthagamani in Sri Lanka during the Second Century B.C. and the expansionist invasions of the Japanese military during the Second World War. The intuitive and contemplative focus of Zen led to it becoming the personal religion of the samurai class of warriors in Japan.

Being in bed with Japanese militarism created an introspective look at their faith and practices by Buddhists and resulted in a more universal outlook by many Japanese traditions. The Japanese people themselves are concerned about a return to the militarism and the militant nationalism of the past. Constitutional constraints limit Japan's ability to project force beyond its shores. There is some fear that US efforts at defense burden-sharing will push Japanese rearmament too far and too fast. Tokyo has exceeded its self-imposed 1% of GNP defense spending ceiling and extended its sealane defense perimeter to 1,000 nautical miles. Japan presently has 60 blue-water warships and four Aegis-class guided-missile cruisers are being procured. Although any Japanese rearmament will take place within the context of the

US-Japan security relationship, concerns still exist. It is generally agreed that there is no political will in the Japanese body politic for a military role larger than that needed to protect national territory and immediate maritime trade routes. But, what about tomorrow?

The Meiji Restoration of the Nineteenth Century used traditional values and spiritual ideas to modernize the Japanese nation. Some of the same spirit was utilized to rebuild postwar Japan and turn it into an economic power. The world would be an uneasy place if the spiritual power of Japan is again directed toward military power rather than the power of trade and economics.

Chapter V Endnotes

1. Eerdman's Handbook of the World's Religions (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1982) p. 228.
2. Ibid, p. 223.
3. Ibid, p. 231 and John M. Koller, Oriental Philosophies, (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1970) pp. 191-193.
4. The Dalai Lama, My Land and My People (New York: Mc Graw-Hill, 1962) pp. 6-7.
5. Sheila Rule, "Dalai Lama Wins the Nobel Peace Prize," New York Times, 6 October 1989, p. A-6.
6. William Theodore de Bary (ed.), The Buddhist Tradition in India, China and Japan (New York: Vintage Books/Random House, 1972) p. 46.
7. Bardwell L. Smith (ed.), Religion and Legitimation of Power in Sri Lanka (Chambersburg, PA: Anima Books/Conococheaque Associates, Inc., 1978) p. 13.
8. Ibid.
9. Ibid, p. 26.
10. John Ferguson, War and Peace in the World's Religions (New York: Oxford University Press, 1974) p. 52.
11. Ibid.
12. Interview with Dr. Alan Bloom, 23 April 1990 (see Appendix VII)
13. Ferguson, op.cit., p. 52.
14. Ibid, pp. 55-56.
15. Trevor Ling, Buddhism, Imperialism and War (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1979) pp. 136-137.

16. Ibid, p. 136.
17. Somboon Suksamran, Buddhism and Politics in Thailand (Singapore: The Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, 1982), pp. 132-157.
18. Quoted in Ibid, p. 150.
19. Guenter Lewy, Religion and Revolution (New York: Oxford University Press, 1974) p. 338.
20. Quoted in Ibid, p. 340.
21. Ibid, p. 344.
22. Micheal Gibson, The Samurai of Japan (London: Wayland Publishers, 1973) p. 24-25.
23. Ibid, pp. 26-27.
24. Archibald Lewis, Knights and Samurai (London: Temple Smith, 1974) p. 78.
25. H. Paul Varley, The Samurai (London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1979), p. 43-44.
26. S. R. Turnbull, The Samurai: A Military History (New York: Macmillan Publishing Co, Inc., 1977) p. 147.
27. Ibid.
28. Oscar Ratti and Adele Westbrook, Secrets of the Samurai (Rutland, Vermont and Tokyo, Japan: Charles E. Tuttle Co., Inc., 1973) p. 451.
29. Inazo Nitobe, Bushido: The Soul of Japan (New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1905) pp. 1-22.
30. Ratti and Westbrook, op.cit., p. 458.
31. Eugen Herrigel, Zen in the Art of Archery (New York: Vantage Books, 1971) p. 73.

32. William K. Bunce, Religions in Japan (Rutland, Vermont and Tokyo, Japan: Charles E. Tuttle Company, 1960) p. 27.
33. D. C. Holtom, Modern Japanese and Shinto Nationalism, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1943) p. 150.
34. Bunce, op.cit., p. 42.
35. Tsunoda Ryusaka, ed. Sources of Japanese Tradition (New York: Columbia University Press, 1958) pp. 797-798.
36. Bloom, op.cit.
37. Tai Ming Cheung, "Sealanes Strategy," Far Eastern Economic Review, 27 July 1989, p. 20.
38. Ibid.
39. "Which Way for US Naval Power in the Asia-Pacific Region?", Asian Defense Journal, December, 1989, p. 19.
40. Robert N. Bellah, Religion and Progress in Modern Asia (New York: Free Press, 1965) pp. 124-126.

CHAPTER VI

JUDAISM

Judaism and War

Jews are called "People of the Book" and "People of the Covenant." The Bible records their history and provides inspiration and guidance. Their covenant with God, defines their identity as a religious community. Both the Bible and the covenant are central to understanding Judaism and, for the purposes of this research, how the faith relates to war.

The Hebrew Bible is divided into three sections by Jewish tradition:

- (a) The Torah (or Pentateuch): The Five Books of Moses including Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy.
- (b) The Prophets: Divided into Earlier Prophets; Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings, and Later Prophets; Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and twelve so-called minor prophets.
- (c) The Writings: Arranged in the order of Psalms, Proverbs, Job, Song of Songs, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, Esther, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah and Chronicles.

For any study of Jewish attitudes toward war, both the Torah and the responsibilities of covenant are key factors. Both the requirements for going to war and the means of conducting war are stated in the Scriptures. The requirements are also related to the idea of being a Chosen People of God. Historical Judaism has given birth to many movements and streams. These have included Hellenistic, Pharisaic, Messianic, Qumranic, Talmudic Apocalyptic, Rabbinic and

Kabballic traditions in the past and the contemporary Reformed, Conservative, Orthodox and secular Zionist traditions today.

Jewish ideas about war originate in the faith's earliest days when Israel was a confederation of tribes. Lord Yahweh, the God who delivered the Hebrews from slavery, was considered a deity of war who won a victory over the mighty armies of Pharaoh. In Exodus Moses sings of his "warrior God":

I will sing to the Lord, for he is highly exalted.
The horse and its rider he has hurled into the sea.
The Lord is my strength and my song; he has become
my salvation. He is my God, and I will praise him,
my father's God, and I will exalt him. The Lord is
a warrior; the Lord is his name. Pharaoh's chariots
and his army, he has hurled into the sea. The best
of Pharaoh's officers are drowned in the Red Sea.
The deep waters have covered them; they sank to the
depths like a stone. Your right hand, O Lord, was
majestic in power. Your right hand, O Lord,
shattered the enemy. 2

The people of Israel were the "armies of the living God."³
Their victories were recorded in the yet to be discovered
"Book of the Wars of God."⁴ God gave direction on strategy,
operations and tactics. War preparations and combat rules and
regulations are recorded in the Torah. The judges, and later
the kings, were warriors as well as monarches.

Not only did this "army of the living God" fight for
their Lord, but God "the warrior" also fought for them.
Examples from the Bible include:

- (a) On a day unlike any "before or since" God held the Sun⁵
still in the sky to aid the Israelites in battle.
- (b) God slayed 185,000 Assyrian soldiers who were besieging⁶
Jerusalem.

(c) God used nature against Sisera in support of Israel's⁷ military campaign.

(d) God moved about in the Israelite camp to "protect Israel⁸ and deliver their enemies to them.

(e) God "went out in front" of Israel to strike the Philistines with angelic armies "marching in the tops of the⁹ Balsam trees."

Victory was delivered to Israel by God. Military force alone was not enough if the Lord did not help. Not only did David say that the Lord "trains his hands for war and his fingers for battle," but also the monarch of Israel said that God "gives his king (David) great victories."¹⁰

Not only would God fight for Israel and fight with Israel, but the Lord would make war on Israel if the covenant people sinned. The enemies of Israel were allowed to chastise and oppress the covenant community. As the prophet Jerimiah preached "a destroyer of nations," the Babylonian empire was¹¹ sent by the Lord to "punish" Israel for its sinfulness. Repentance and adherence to the law and covenant of God would bring reconciliation and an end to divinely-orchestrated defeats, military reversals or oppression by enemy nations.

The Types of Wars

The wars of Israel were the "wars of God" or "the wars of Yahweh" so the Lord had to be consulted before war was waged. As already mentioned, God gave instructions on the use of force. Deuteronomy 20: 1-20 summarizes the law of war for the Israelite soldier:

When you got to war against your enemies and see horses and chariots and an army greater than yours, do not be afraid of them, because the Lord your God, who brought you up out of Egypt, will be with you. When you about to go into battle, the priest shall come forward and address the army. He shall say: "Hear, O Israel, today you are going into battle against your enemies. Do not be fainthearted or afraid; do not be terrified or give way to panic before them. For the Lord your God is the one who goes with you to fight for you against your enemies to give you victory."

The officers shall say to the army: "Has anyone built a new house and not dedicated it? Let him go home, or he may die in battle and someone else may dedicate it. Has anyone planted a vineyard and not begun to enjoy it? Let him go home, or he may die in battle and someone else enjoy it. Has anyone become pledged to a woman and not married her? Let him go home, or he may die in battle and someone else marry her. Then the officers shall add, "Is any man afraid or fainthearted? Let him go home so that his brothers will not become disheartened too." When the officers have finished speaking to the army, they shall appoint commanders over it.

When you march up to attack a city, make its people an offer of peace. If they accept and open their gates, all the people in it shall be subject to forced labor and shall work for you. If they refuse to make peace and they engage you in battle, lay siege to that city. When the Lord your God delivers it into your hand, put to the sword all the men in it. As for the women, the children, the livestock and everything else in the city, you may take these as plunder for yourselves. And you may use the plunder the Lord your God gives you from your enemies. This is how you are to treat all the cities that are at distance from you and do not belong to the nations nearby.

However, in the cities of the nations the Lord your God is giving you as an inheritance, do not leave alive anything that breathes. Completely destroy them-the Hittites, Amorites, Canaanites, Perizzites, Hittites and Jebusites-as the Lord your God has commanded you. Otherwise, they will teach you to follow all the detestable things they do in worshiping their gods, and you will sin against the Lord your God.

When you lay siege to a city for a long time, fighting against it to capture it, do not destroy its trees by putting an ax to them, because you can eat their fruit. Do not cut them down. Are the trees of the field people, that you should besiege

them? However, you may cut down trees that you know are not fruit trees and use them to build siege works until the city at war with you falls.

The tenets of the Jewish ethics of war are clear in this chapter:

- (a) Fearlessness in battle for Israel and God.
- (b) God fights with Israel and delivers victory over all foes.
- (c) Priests accompany the troops into battle (Yahweh's Chaplains Corps).
- (d) Those newly married, those who have recently constructed a home, those who have recently planted a vineyard and the faint hearted are exempt from service.
- (e) Peace offers were to be made to avoid war if possible.
- (f) Idolaters must be killed if they refuse to give up idolatry.
- (g) Do not devastate the land or the environment while waging war.

In the Jewish ethic of war there are four categories of the use of force. The first type is the war of extermination. This is what was conducted against the Amalekites by God's order. The Lord commands through Samuel:

This is what the Lord Almighty says: "I will punish the Amalekites for what they did to Israel when they waylaid them as they came up from Egypt. Now go, attack the Amalekites and totally destroy everything that belongs to them. Do not spare them; put to death men and women, children and infants, cattle and sheep, camels and donkeys." 12

The second category is the war of possession. This was the campaign that Israel fought to claim the Promised Land of

Canaan from the polytheistic tribes that resided there. The same rules outlined in Deuteronomy 20 applied in the war to win the land of Canaan for God and Israel, but if the Canaanites refused the peace terms they were to be exterminated. This total destruction of all life is called the ban or herem. It is considered necessary to keep the covenant community pure, undefiled and uncontaminated by any remnant of idolatrous culture that would be permitted to survive.¹³ The war of possession ended after the time of Joshua.

The third category of war is the war of permission. This was an aggressive war waged for purposes of territorial expansion; this developed during the United Monarchy period. The Israelite king was required to "inquire of the Lord" and receive permission from God and the religious leadership before using military force.¹⁴ In a war of permission, since there was no immediate threat, only single able-bodied men¹⁵ were enlisted for combat. Out of compassionate concerns those identified in Deuteronomy 20: 5-8 were exempt from military service.

The war of obligation is the final category. This type includes the conquest of Canaan but, after that period, is applied only to a war of self-defense. If the Promised Land was invaded by an enemy, then the covenant community was mandated to fight. Every defensive battle is a "war of Yahweh."¹⁶ In a war of obligation military service was in

principle compulsory and universal. Even the newly wed,
exempt in the rules of Deuteronomy 20, was required to
participate in this category of war.¹⁷

The Torah provides instructions on preparations for war. The priest not only sacrificed to God before the deployment of troops, but also accompanied the troops in battle. The priestly responsibilities of the military chaplains included reading the law of war to the troops.

Jewish Resistance to Oppression

The Jewish ethic requires resistance to oppression. This includes, if necessary, the use of force.¹⁸ Several times in ancient history, Jews took up arms to preserve their religion and way of life. The revolt of the Maccabees against Seleucid rule and their policy of forced Hellenization is one example. The first leader of this Second Century BC fight for religious freedom, Mattathias, is described in terms reminiscent of the military commanders during the era of the Judges. The exhortation of Judas Maccabees to his troops expresses military principles seen in concepts of war in Israel's earlier history:

It is easy for many to be hemmed in by few, for in the sight of Heaven there is no difference between saving by many or by few. It is not on the size of the army that victory in battle depends, but strength comes from Heaven. He himself will crush them before us; as for you, do not be afraid of them.¹⁹

The Zealot revolts of the first century AD, and the sicarii wing of assassins within the movement, were motivated by concepts related to the war of obligation. One Biblical

scholar, writing about the first ill-fated Jewish revolt against the mighty Roman Empire (66-73 AD) said:

Their apparently hopeless resistance to their heathen besiegers in the face of incredible difficulties must have been inspired to some extent by the faithful hope that God would intervene in some miraculous manner and deliver them from the hands of the Romans-as he had from the Assyrians in the days of pious Hezekiah, and from the Seleucids in the days of the pious and zealous Maccabees. 20

Both the Zealots and the Maccabees assumed the ethical basis of resistance to evil as the justification for using force. Striking out against foreign occupation forces oppressing God's people in God's Promised Land was in accordance with God's will. To fight an idolatrous oppressor whose very presence on sacred territory violated the sanctity of Torah, covenant and Temple was participation in a war of obligation to the zealous Jews. This led to the expectation of divine military support from the Lord or the coming of God's anointed one, the Messiah. Both the Jewish War of 66-70 A.D. and the revolt of Jews who believed Bar Kochba to be the Messiah from 132-135 A.D. were fought in the firm belief that the present age was coming to an end and the miraculous intervention of God, as declared in the prophetic and apocalyptic writings, was imminent. 21 22

Eschatology and War

Apocalyptic Judaism, expressed in literature like the canonical Book of Daniel and the extra-canonical 2 Enoch held the conviction that the present world was under the control of demonic powers and that God would soon end this age and establish a new age with a New Israel and New Jerusalem as the

center of the universe. This "eschaton," ("end-time" or "last days") re-creation of the cosmos would be through the Lord's direct intervention or the sending of an emissary, the expected military-king, the Messiah, or a divine being called the Son of Man.²³ These dying throes of the present age would involve "signs of the time" like earthquakes, unusual events, famines and finally, a great war involved God's People and the angels fighting on the side of God and evil men and demons²⁴ battling to maintain the control of Satan. Michael the Archangel would be the military commander of the heavenly forces and their human allies in this final battle against evil. The War of the Sons of Light Against the Sons of Darkness, a scroll of the Qumran community that thrived near the Dead Sea two thousand years ago, is a document that reflects the apocalyptic certainty of an ultimate eschatological war. The War Scroll's purpose is to provide the members of the Dead Sea sect with a detailed set of rules, regulations and plans for the coming confrontation with the forces of evil.²⁵ The community would be fighting alongside the angelic hosts themselves. The strictest adherence to the Torah edicts on war preparation and military conduct was required. The War Scroll prepared humans to battle with divine comrades-in-arms.²⁶

Apocalyptic Judaism, with its expectations of messianic deliverance and intervention by God and the angels, led to the two revolts against Rome that ultimately brought tragic results to the Jewish nation.²⁷ For this reason apocalyptic

literature and messianic movements were discredited in the eyes of all but a few zealous Jews.²⁸ However, apocalyptic thought would play a great role in the theology of earliest Christianity, and Jews would again take up arms in the 1940's for God, Israel and political independence.

Contemporary Judaism and War

Jewish ethics of war remain consistent with the war of obligation.²⁹ The wars of possession, extermination and permission no longer exist. The contemporary nation-state of Israel is a paradox. It is "a quasi-theocratic state" with a democratic form of government.³⁰ Though a secular state, the military has religious advisors to insure that war is conducted by the tenets of the Law of Moses.³¹ The Jewish view of war today is centered on self-defense and deterrence. For Israel, a pre-emptive strike is permissible as an act of self-defense in the ethic of a war of obligation.³²

In summary, the Jewish ethic of war involves a tradition that includes rules and regulations for military personnel as elaborate as the kshatriya codes of Hinduism. War is seen as sanctioned and assisted by God. In some instances, such as self-defense and resistance to oppression, use of force is obligatory. Though a religion that values peace, Judaism is not a religion for pacifists. Universal peace for all humanity is an ideal of Judaism. But the idea of peace does not include a belief that one practices nonresistance to evil like the Christian idea of pacifism. As one author wrote:

(The Jew) became a man of war, intrepid in battle, unmatched in valor. Like the Greeks, the Jews had their Marathon, magnificent victories in the face of incredible odds. But, unlike the Greeks, who remained passive after their defeat at the hands of the Romans, the Jews rose time and again in armed rebellion against their oppressors, striking for their freedom and religious liberty. The stereotyped mask of meekness was later fitted on the Jew by Western civilization. 33

Chapter VI Endnotes

1. Geoffrey Parrinder (ed.), World Religions From Ancient History to the Present (New York: Facts on File Publications, 1984) p. 385.
2. Exodus 15:1-6.
3. 1 Samuel 17:26.
4. Numbers 21:14.
5. Joshua 10:12-14.
6. 2 Kings 19:32-36.
7. Judges 5:4, 20-21.
8. Deuteronomy 23:14.
9. 2 Samuel 5:24.
10. Psalm 144:1 and Psalm 18:50.
11. Jerimiah 4:7; 6:6.
12. 1 Samuel 15:2-3.
13. J. H. Hertz (ed.), Pentateuch and Haftorahs, 2nd ed. (London: Soncino Press, 1960) p. 833.
14. 1 Kings 8:44-45; 22:5-6.
15. Interview with Chaplain Johnathan Panitz, 10 May 1990 (see Appendix IX).
16. Xavier Leon-Dufour, Dictionary of Biblical Theology, (New York: The Seabury Press, 1973) p. 640.
17. John Ferguson, War and Peace in the World's Religions (New York: Oxford University Press, 1974) p. 93.
18. Panitz, op.cit.
19. 1 Maccabees 3:18-19, 22.
20. William R. Farmer, Maccabees, Zealots and Josephus. (New

York: Columbia University Press, 1958) p. 107.

21. Diane Kennedy Pike and R. Scott Kennedy, The Wilderness Revolt (New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1972) p. 23.

22. Ibid., p. 25.

23. Ibid., pp. 25-28.

24. Ibid., pp. 27-28.

25. Yigael Yadin, The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light Against the Sons of Darkness (London: Oxford University Press, 1962) p. 4.

26. Ibid., pp. 4-5.

27. Pike and Kennedy, op.cit., p. 25.

28. Ibid.

29. Panitz, op.cit.

30. Ibid.

31. Ibid.

32. Ibid.

33. Max I. Dimont, Jews, God and History (New York: Signet Books/New American Library, 1962) pp. 52-53.

CHAPTER VII

CHRISTIANITY

The Ethics of Jesus

Philosophical influences on Christianity in ancient times came from a rich variety of sources. Greek philosophy, Latin legalism, the views of pre-Christian polytheism in lands missionized and the Hebrew traditions of the Old Testament all played a part in the theological development of Christianity. However, Christians generally agree that the most authoritative source of Christian thinking in contemporary times is the Bible. Special emphasis is placed on the New Testament with the sayings of Jesus Christ being the pre-eminent authority.¹ The Christian seeks to live in harmony with the will of God and the Biblical spirit as expressed in the life, model and teachings of Jesus.² Within Christian theology there are two primary schools of thought about war and the use of force by states. On one hand is nonresistance and pacifism. On the other hand is the tradition of just war. In formulating and presenting their arguments both sides have appealed to the teachings and actions of Jesus and the spirit, law and words of the Bible.

Early Christianity and War

In his sermons and lessons, Jesus emphasizes the necessity for peaceful resolution of conflict. In his Sermon on the Mount he preaches that "true happiness" and "joy" or "being blessed" lies in promoting reconciliation and nonresistance to persecution. The passage commonly called the

Beatitudes illustrates this ethical view:

Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. Blessed are those who mourn, for they will be comforted. Blessed are the meek, for they will inherit the earth. Blessed are those who hunger and thirst for righteousness, for they will be filled. Blessed are the merciful, for they will be shown mercy. Blessed are the pure in heart, for they will see God. Blessed are those who are persecuted because of righteousness, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. Blessed are you when people insult you, persecute you and falsely say all kinds of evil against you because of me. Rejoice and be glad, because great is your reward in heaven, for in the same way they persecuted the prophets who were before you. 3

Jesus proclaimed himself to be the Messiah and the Son of Man that the Jews were expecting. However, he proved not to be the military leader expousing revolution against Rome that the Jews hoped the Messiah to be. Although he spoke of "the sword" and "war" it was always in a time that though imminent, had not yet arrived. The future would bring for the Jews and the world violence and conflict at the end of the age:

You will hear of wars and rumors of wars, but see to it that you are not alarmed. Such things must happen, but the end is still to come. Nation will rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom. There will be famines and earthquakes in various places. All these are the beginning of birth pains. 4

The coming of Jesus had set in motion the process that would bring on the eschaton, the end-time, and even though followers were counseled to be peaceful, the last days were not a time of peace.

Do not suppose that I have come to bring peace to the earth. I did not come to bring peace, but a sword. For I have come to turn "a man against his father, a daughter against her mother, a daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law, a man's enemies will be the members of his own household."

Anyone who loves his father or mother more than me is not worthy of me; anyone who loves his son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me; and anyone who does not take his cross and follow me is not worthy of me. Whoever finds his life will lose it, and whoever loses his life for my sake will find it. 5

Like the Jewish apocalypics who were his contemporaries and predecessors Jesus preached that the last days will involve a great final confrontation between God and the forces of righteousness on one side and Satan and the forces of evil on the other. God's judgement will follow. There would be no peace until the eschatological peace established by the re-creation of the universe by God. Christ's peace was not the
6
peace of this world.

Thus, unlike the Zealots and the Qumran Dead Sea Scroll community members, the earliest Christians did not expect to war alongside the "sons of light" against the "sons of darkness." When the Second Coming of Christ did not happen as soon as the early Church expected, the "final war" was projected more and more into the future. "War language" became an acceptable analogy for the Christian life and the spiritual struggles of the believer. Examples of this include:

- (a) Comparing Christian ministry to soldiering.⁷
- (b) Comparing the call of ministry to the trumpet call of battle.⁸
- (c) Outlining differences between the wars and weapons of "the world" and the Christian community.⁹
- (d) Calling Christians to "put on the full armor of God."¹⁰

- (e) Counseling Christians to "fight the good fight."¹¹
- (f) Referring to Christians as "good soldiers of Jesus Christ."¹²
- (g) Comparing the Scriptures to a "double-edged sword."¹³
- (h) Calling the spiritual struggle of Christians a "war."¹⁴

Through the first centuries of Christianity two distinct streams of thought developed as Christendom waited for the eschatological battlefields of Armageddon. One supported just war and even crusade. The other supported nonresistance and pacifism.

The Just War Tradition

The growth of the just war tradition accelerates with the conversion of Constantine to Christianity and the religion merging more and more with the imperial ideology of the Roman Empire.¹⁵

Ambrose (339-397 AD), the Bishop of Milan, appears to have first formulated a Christian ethic allowing participation in war.¹⁶ His famous convert, Augustine, would develop the concepts even more and provide the basis for Aquinas' writings on just war. In his writings, Ambrose, a government official in northern Italy before being appointed to the bishopric of Milan:

- (a) Compared the defense of the Empire against barbarians to the defense of Christianity.
- (b) Borrowed from Stoicism, Cicero and the Old Testament to justify the accommodation of military service and Christianity.

(c) Relegated Christian pacifism to the clergy and the individual conscience of the believer.

(d) Stated that the conduct of war should be just. ¹⁷

"No eagles and birds must lead the army" he wrote, "but thy name and religion, O Jesus." ¹⁸ Ambrose's thought provided two basic concepts of just war theory in Christianity. Like the Chinese philosophers, he taught that war should be conducted in a manner consistent with morality and ethics. Secondly, like the Hindu tradition, he taught that "religious professionals" like the clergy should abstain from combat.

Augustine amplified what Ambrose sketched. Motivated by the writings of Plato and Cicero, and his own view that peace was an eschatological reality not achievable on earth by human means, Augustine developed his own points for just war. These include the following:

(a) War is for the sake of restoring peace, protecting the safety of citizens and promoting just causes.

(b) War is the province of rulers only.

(c) War is to be waged only out of necessity.

(d) Martial ability is a gift from God among other gifts.

(e) "It is still a higher glory to stay war itself with a word than slay men with a sword." ¹⁹

(f) The "evils of war;" "love of violence, revengeful cruelty," "wild resistance," "fierce and implacable enmity" ²⁰ and the "lust for power" are taboo in a just war.

(g) Mercy is "due to the vanquished, or the captive" to ²¹ promote war termination and postwar peace and reconciliation.

- (h) Only one side in a war can be just.
- (i) Clergy and monks must not engage in warfare at all.

In his Summa of Theology Thomas Aquinas (Question 40) repeats Augustine's themes in his own comments on just war:

Three conditions are necessary for a just war. First, that the ruler have the authority to declare war. A private individual may not declare war, for he can rely on his superior's judgement to protect his rights; nor has he any right to mobilize the people, which must be done in war. But since responsibility for public action is committed to the rulers, they are charged with the defense of the city, the kingdom, or the province subject to them. And just as in punishing criminals they are justly defending the state with the civil arms against all internal disturbance; as the Apostle says (Rom. 13: 4): "Not without cause does he carry a sword; for he is God's minister, an avenger to execute wrath upon him who doth evil," so also they are responsible to defend the state against external foes with war weapons. Rulers are told in Psalm 81: "Rescue the poor; and deliver the needy out of the hand of the sinner." Hence Augustine says in Against Faustus XXIII, 73: "To maintain peace within the natural order of men, rulers require the power and decision to declare war."

Second, a just cause is required, so that those who are attacked for some fault merit such an attack. Hence Augustine says in Eighty-three Questions: "Those wars are usually defined as just that avenge injuries, as when a nation or state should be punished for neglecting to amend some injury inflicted or to restore what was taken unjustly."

Third, a right intention on the belligerents' part is required -either to promote some good or to avoid some evil. Hence Augustine says in the book On the Lord's Words: "For the true worshipers of God even wars are peaceful, not waged out of greed or cruelty, but from the zeal for peace, to restrain evil or to assist the good. But it can happen that even if war is waged by legitimate authority with just cause, nevertheless the war may be made unjust through evil intention. For Augustine says in Against Faustus LXXIV: "The desire to hurt, the

cruelty of vendetta, the implacable and severe spirit, arrogance in winning, the thirst for power and such things-all these are rightly condemned in war." 22

Again in Summa of Theology (Question 42) Aquinas, like Confucius and Mencius, sanctions the use of force in overthrowing an evil ruler:

...Tyrannical government is unjust because it is not directed to the common good but the private good of the ruler, as is clear from the philosopher in Politics III and Ethics VIII. Therefore the overthrow of such government is not strictly sedition, unless perhaps when accompanied by such disorder that the community suffers greater harm than from the tyrannical government. A tyrant is himself, moreover, far more seditious when he spreads discord and strife among the people subject to him so that he may dominate them more easily. For tyranny is the directing of affairs to the private benefit of the ruler with harm to the community. 23

These three thinkers presented the ideas and values that remain the foundation for just war theories in current Christian, moral and political philosophies today. In discussing why and when recourse to war is permissible, the National Conference of (US) Catholic Bishops presented the following criteria for just war following "the logic of Augustine and Aquinas" and "papal teaching":

(a) Just Cause: Protect innocent life, secure basic rights, preserve conditions necessary for decent human existence and self-defense.

(b) Competent Authority: Declared by those with responsibility for public order (duly elected representatives of the people) not private groups or individuals.

(c) Comparative Justice: War is more just than not going to war.

(d) Right Intention: Legitimate reasons related to just cause like pursuing peace and reconciliation, the avoidance of unnecessary destruction and unreasonable conditions for surrender.

(e) Last Resort: All peaceful alternatives to the use of force have been tried and exhausted.

(f) Probability of Success: Abandoning recourse to hopeless resistance or irrational use of force.

(g) Proportionality: Damage to be inflicted and the costs incurred by war must be proportionate to the good expected by use of force.

(h) Jus in Bello: Protection of civilians and noncombatants, discriminate use of force, restraint in terms of "weapons of mass destruction" like nuclear, chemical and biological arms.²⁴

Similarly, advocates of the just war tradition cite scriptural examples such as:

(a) Jesus using force to expel the money-lenders from the Temple in Jerusalem.²⁵

(b) Jesus as the military commander of the armies of heaven.²⁶

(c) Jesus counseling his disciples to purchase swords.²⁷

(d) God's delegation of executive authority (the sword) to the earthly ruler.²⁸

The just war tradition is criticized by those who say it is too easily utilized by states and insurgent groups to rationalize their use of force. During the n l p

Europe just war became "holy war" with military orders of knights, "monks of war," ready to engage in crusades.²⁹

Even today, insurgents, inspired by liberation theology, rise up against governments using just war concepts to validate their violence.³⁰ Still, the just war tradition remains the primary means utilized for Christianity to view the use of force.³¹

Nonresistance and Pacifism

Pacifism is motivated by various schools of personal and spiritual belief. Examples of different areas of pacifist thought include:

- (a) Vocational pacifism: Priests, clergy, monks, nuns, members of holy orders, brahmas and other religious professionals fall into this category.
- (b) Absolute pacifism: People who believe all killing of human beings is intrinsically evil. This group would also include opponents of the death penalty.
- (c) Gandhian pacifism: Advocates of nonviolent social change who reject violence as a means of political expression.
- (d) Situational pacifism: People who evaluate each war on the basis of whether the cause is just or not.

Within the Christian religion pacifism may be rooted in these concerns and others. Spiritual ideas that inspire Christian pacifists include:

- (a) The universality of the Church: Christianity is a universal religion with ultimate concerns that transcend nationality. Since adherents live in all nations, the Church

should not take sides in conflicts between nations.

(b) Eschatological pacifism: The opposite of the Jewish apocalyptic view discussed in the previous chapter this idea holds that all human wars are to be avoided because the only "just war" will be the final war between God and Satan at the end-time.

(c) Just war: Christians only participate in a war if the cause is consistent with the faith's criteria of justice.

(d) The Antichrist: All human governments are by nature evil and a kind of Anti-Christ. Serving them in war merely serves the ends of the Devil.

(e) The Peacemaker ethic: Jesus calls all Christians to nonviolence, nonresistance and the ethics of peacemaking by his life, ministry and teaching.

It is certainly the words of Christ, the peacemaker ethic, which is the one category appealed to the most by Christians when discussing pacifism.³² The guidelines for the Christian life spoken by Jesus in the Beatitudes are augmented by calls for nonresistance to oppression:

You have heard that it was said, "Eye for eye, and tooth for tooth." But I tell you; Do not resist an evil person. If someone strikes you on the right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if someone wants to sue you and take your tunic, let him have you cloak as well. If someone forces you to go one mile, go with him two miles. Give to the one who asks you, and do not turn away from the one who wants to borrow from you. 33

This "turn the other cheek ethic" separates Christianity from the two other Semitic monotheisms. Judaism, as stated in

the previous chapter has an obligation of resistance. In the next chapter it will be shown that Islam has a similar obligation as Judaism.

Prior to the conversion of Constantine and the Christianization of the Roman Empire (or, as others argue, the Romanization of Christianity) the peacemaker ethic of Jesus was used by Church leaders to counsel Christians to abstain from Roman military service. The requirements to kill and practice idolatry (emperor worship) concerned the spiritual leaders of the faith. Just as Fourth Century AD church leaders like Ambrose and Augustine wrote articulately for just war consistent with Christian values, earlier theologians wrote just as articulately for pacifism based on the peacemaker ethic. In a treatise entitled "One Government Service" Origen (185-254 AD) argued that the spiritual vocation ordained for Christians by Jesus precludes service in the Roman military:

And to those enemies of our faith who require us to bear arms for the commonwealth, and to slay men, we can reply: "Do not those who are priests at certain shrines, and those who attend on certain gods, as you account them, keep their hands free from blood, that they may with hands unstained and free from human blood offer the appointed sacrifices to your gods; and even when war is upon you, you never enlist the priests in the army. If that, then, is a laudable custom, how much more so, that while others are engaged in battle, these too should engage as the priests and ministers of God, keeping their hands pure, and wrestling in prayers to God on behalf of those who are fighting in a righteous cause, and for the king who reigns righteously, that whatever is opposed to those who act righteously may be destroyed!" And as we by our prayers vanquish all demons who stir up war, and lead to the violation of oaths, and disturb the peace, we in this way are much more helpful to the kings than

those who go into the field to fight for them. And we do take our part in public affairs. And none fight better for the king than we do. We do not indeed fight under him, although he require it; but we fight on his behalf, forming a special army-an army of piety-by offering our prayers to God. 34

Tertullian (155-240 AD) in his essay "Christians and Military Service" writes that Jesus has "taken away the sword" from members of the Church:

In that last section, decision may seem to have been given likewise concerning military service, which is between dignity and power. But now inquiry is made about this point, whether a believer may turn himself unto military service, and whether the military may be admitted unto the faith, even the rank and file, or each inferior grade, to whom there is no necessity for taking part in sacrifices or capital punishments. There is no agreement between the divine and the human sacrament, the standard of Christ and the standard of the devil, the camp of light and the camp of darkness. One soul cannot be due to two masters-God and Caesar. And yet Moses carried a rod, and Aaron wore a buckle, and John (Baptist) is girt with leather, and Joshua the son of Nun leads a line of march; and the People warred: if it pleases you to sport with the subject. But how will a Christian man war, nay, how will he serve even in peace, without a sword, which the Lord has taken away? For albeit soldiers had come unto John, and had received the formula of their rule; albeit, likewise, a centurion had believed; still the Lord afterward, in disarming Peter, unbelted every soldier. 35

As seen already however when the Pax Romana (Peace imposed by the Roman Empire) and the Pax Christi (Peace that is the gift of Christ) increasingly came to be synonymous, the need for the everyday Christian to take up arms to defend a Christian Roman Empire became acceptable to the Church.

The Church and The World

In summary, Christianity has two views on war. One is rooted in the teachings of the faith that emphasize peace, nonviolence and nonresistance. Groups such as the Quakers and Mennonites embody these ideals in our contemporary society. The other view, reaching a compromise between the ideal faith and the real world, finds war as acceptable if consistent with Christian principles of justice. Christianity also makes allowance for individual conscience in matters related to the use of force. Even the just war tradition views war as a last resort. The Church supports the pursuit of such goals as preventive diplomacy, deterrence, arms control and eliminating fundamental causes of conflict before force is used.

Though Christ calls Christians to be idealistic, living in the world also means being realistic. This also requires vigilance that the Christian faith is not seduced by the state³⁶ in support of wars of aggression disguised as just wars. Living and participating in the world does not excuse collaboration with sin and evil.

Reinhold Niebuhr (1892-1971) in his 1948 essay, "Why the Christian Church is Not Pacifist," while advocating what has been called "Christian Realism," raises this issue in discussing heretical and non-heretical forms of pacifism. In concluding he writes:

It is a terrible thing to take human life. The conflict between man and man and nation and nation is tragic. If there are men who declare that no matter what the consequences, they cannot bring themselves to participate in this slaughter, the Church ought to be able to say to the general

community: We quite understand this scruple and we respect it. It proceeds from the conviction that the true end of man is brotherhood, and that love is the law of life. We who allow ourselves to become engaged in war need this testimony of the absolutists against us, lest we accept the warfare of the world as normative, lest we become callous to the horror of war, and lest we forget the ambiguity of our own actions and motives and the risk we run of achieving no permanent good from this momentary anarchy in which we are involved. 37

CHAPTER VII Endnotes

1. Interview with Rev. Gwynne Schultz, 25 April 1990 (see Appendix VIII).
2. Interview with Rev. Madelon Wheeler-Gibb, 21 April 1990 (see Appendix VI).
3. Matthew 5: 3-12.
4. Matthew 24: 6-8.
5. Matthew 10: 34-39.
6. John 15: 27.
7. 1 Corinthians 9: 7.
8. 1 Corinthians 14: 8.
9. 2 Corinthians 10: 3-4.
10. Ephesians 6: 11-17.
11. 1 Timothy 1: 18.
12. 2 Timothy 2: 3-4.
13. Hebrews 4: 12.
14. 1 Peter 2: 11.
15. Schultz, op.cit.
16. Roland H. Bainton, Christian Attitudes Toward War and Peace (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1960) p. 89.
17. Ibid, pp. 90-91.
18. Quoted in Ibid, p. 90.
19. Henry Paolucci (ed.), The Political Writings of St. Augustine (Chicago: Regnery Gateway, 1962) p. 183.
20. Ibid, p. 164.
21. Ibid, p. 183.

22. Mary T. Clark (ed.), An Aquinas Reader (New York: Image Books, 1972) p. 381-382.
23. Ibid, p. 382.
24. The Challenge of Peace: God's Promise and Our Response (Washington DC: US Catholic Conference, 1983) pp. 26-34.
25. Matthew 21: 12, Mark 11: 15, Luke 14: 45, John 2: 15.
26. Revelation 19: 11-15.
27. Luke 22: 36-37.
28. Romans 13: 4.
29. Desmond Seward, The Monks of War (Hamden, Conn: Archon Books, 1972) pp. 3-8.
30. David C. Rapport and Yonah Alexander, The Morality of Terrorism (New York: Pergamon Press, 1982) pp 99-123.
31. Schultz, op.cit.
32. Ibid.
33. Matthew 5: 38-42.
34. Arthur F. Holmes, War and Christian Ethics (Grand Rapids, Mich: Baker Book House, 1975) p. 49.
35. Ibid, pp. 43-44.
36. Schultz, op.cit.
37. Holmes, op.cit., p. 313.

CHAPTER VIII

ISLAM

The Five Pillars of Islam

For two primary reasons Islam has become part of the consciousness of the West in the past two decades. The first consciousness awakening came with the mid-1970s global oil crisis that followed the Yom Kippur War. The second was the 1979 Iranian embassy seizure and the hostage crisis that grew from it.

Islam is an Arabic word that means submission--in this case, submission to the will of God (Allah). Moslem, or Muslim, the participial form, means one who submits. Unlike other religions there is no hierarchy, no clergy, no priesthood, no intermediary between humanity and God. The youngest among the major world religions, Islam originated in the Seventh Century A.D. as a result of the life and work of "the first Muslim," Muhammed.

Muhammed is considered by the faith to be last in the line of prophets. Islam considers itself to be the continuation and rectification of the monotheism of Judaism¹ and Christianity. So closely aligned are the religions that the Jewish scriptures and the prophetic mission of Jesus are incorporated by reference in the Holy Book of Islam, the Koran, which was written by Muhammed. The basic duties, practices and beliefs of Islam are summarized in the "five pillars" of the religion accepted by all Muslims. These are:

(a) Shahada: Public recital of the two fundamental tenets of

the faith; "la ilaha illa Allah" ("There is no God but Allah.") and "Muhammadum rasulu Allah" ("Muhammed is His Prophet").

(b) Salat: Devotional worship and formal prayer practiced five times a day (dawn, midday, midafternoon, sunset and after nightfall).

(c) Zakat: An obligatory tax for the needy.

(d) Sawn: The fast during the lunar month of Ramadan.

(e) Haji: The pilgrimage to the Kaaba, the holy shrine in Mecca.
2

Islam is divided into various sects. These include the Sunni (the vast majority), Sufi, Shi'a, Druse, Hanafi and Alawite movements.
3

Jihad: The "Sixth Pillar" of Righteous War

The concept of "jihad", which means "striving," is considered by some Muslims to be "the sixth pillar of Islam."
4
Muslims assert, as do the Jews, that to translate their religious obligation of resistance by force as "holy war" is incorrect.
5
There are three kinds of striving or jihad. The first is the inner struggle by the Muslim against evil, the second is the correction of wrong and the third is war against unbelievers and enemies of the faith. In his book, In the Path of God, Daniel Pipes writes:

The division between Muslim and non-Muslim has dominated the military sphere too. While the Shari'a (Islamic law) prohibits fighting between observant Muslims, it permits (and on some occasions even requires) Muslims to make war on non-Muslims. War on behalf of Islam is known as jihad and is usually translated into English as "holy war." But "holy war" brings to mind warriors going off to

battle with God in their hearts intent on spreading the faith-something like medieval European crusaders or soldiers of the Reformation. Jihad is less a holy war than a "righteous war," fighting carried out in accordance with the Shari'a. Of course, jihad must be on behalf of Islam, but the emphasis of its definition is on legality, not on holiness. A Muslim may go to battle with thoughts of Allah or he may dream of booty; the key is that his behavior should conform to the Shari'a and thereby increase the scope of its application. Not every attack on non-Muslims qualifies as jihad; there are elaborate restrictions which, if transgressed, make the fighting non-Shari'a and therefore no jihad. For instance, if an attack breaks an oath, it is not righteous war. Conversely, jihad can be directed against Muslims who flout the Shari'a, including apostates and brigands-hardly what "holy war" brings to mind. 6

Pipes continues that the priority of jihad is to spread the religion of Islam, but the perceived benefits of rule by Islamic law:

More important yet, jihad is not holy war because its purpose is not to spread the faith. Non-Muslims commonly assume that jihad calls for the militant expansion of the Islamic religion; in fact, its purpose is to spread the rule of Islamic law. The logic behind law being the central concern of jihad has special importance for the topic of Islam and political power: to approach God properly, man must live by the Shari'a; because the Shari'a contains provisions which can only be executed by a government, the state has to be in the hands of Muslims; Muslims must therefore control territory; to do this, they need to wage war, and thus, the provision for jihad. If Muslims do not rule, kafirs (non-Muslims) do; by definition, the latter do not see the Shari'a as a sacred law. For expediency's sake, to minimize Muslim antagonism toward their rule, non-Muslims may enforce some Islamic precepts, especially private ones, but they would never go to the effort of implementing Shari'a public regulations. For these reasons, Islam requires the expulsion of non-Muslims from power and their replacement by believers, by force, if necessary.

Jihad, offensive in Dar al-Harb (lands not under Muslim control), defensive in Dar al-Islam (lands under Muslim control), takes many forms: insurrection, invasion, aid to neighbors, self-defense, or guerrilla action. In addition to

polities, tribes and individual warriors can launch a jihad on their own. Muslim power should be extended both to areas where Muslims already live and to where they do not, for Shari'a rule (in the Islamic view) brings advantages even to non-Muslims by preventing them from engaging in practices forbidden by God. Jihad, Muslims believe, should continue until they take control of the entire planet and all mankind becomes subject to Islam's law. 7

Jihad implies conquest, but not necessarily forced religious conversions. All kafirs, or non-Muslims, are to be subjugated to Islamic political authority. The "conquered" known as "Ahl al-Kitab" ("People of the Book") who practice Judaism, Christianity or Zoroastrianism are allowed to continue their religion uninhibited. This liberality, however, did not extend to the "mushrikun" (polytheists). "Idolaters" were required to convert to Islam, Judaism or Christianity. Failure to choose a monotheistic faith will result in exile or even death. Though not forcibly converted, non-Islamic monotheists were taxed by the Muslim sate.

War was a large part of the expansion of Islam from its earliest days. Muhammed himself fought at least five battles "in the defense of Islam" during his life. The first century of Islam saw adherents based in Arabia conquer to Spain in the West and India in the East. The concept of jihad was used by Muslims as a focus for nationalism and anti-colonialism in the same manner Saya San used Buddhism in Burma. Obviously, Islam, like Judaism and Christianity, has a messianic and millenarian tradition that can be exploited for revolutionary purposes.

Across the vast area stretching from Indonesia to Morocco the battle cry, "Islam is in danger" was heard in early opposition to Western imperialism and colonialism.¹² In the Islamic schools of Algeria the students began each day by reciting in unison: "Islam is my religion, Arabic is my language, Algeria is my country."¹³ Islamic nationalists continually stated that, according to Sharia, European kafirs were not fit to rule over Muslims.

The Sudanese rebellion in the 1800s by Muslims who believed the religious leader Muhammed Ahmed to be the Mahdi (Messiah) is an example of how Islam and nationalism united to oppose Egyptian administration and British colonialism.¹⁴ The revolt against the "Turks" (Turkish, Egyptian or European authorities) was deemed a "jihad" by "the Mahdi's" followers.¹⁵ The revolution's purpose was eschatological. Muslims were living in the last days and were fighting not only to restore the rule of Sharia in Sudan, but to bring about the rule of Allah on Earth through his representative the Mahdi.¹⁶ By 1884 Muhammed Ahmed ruled half of the country, and on January 26, 1885 his forces took Khartoum, the capital city of Sudan. Only his death six months later prevented the Mahdi from completing his plans to extend the jihad to Egypt and, eventually, the whole world.

Islamic leaders do admit that, despite the effectiveness of their faith as a force for nationalism and anti-colonialism, Islam and the idea of jihad have been misused or misinterpreted for pure political purposes.¹⁷ When asked if the

revolution in Iran represented "a renaissance of Islam," an Egyptian mullah, Imam Azhar Gad al-Haq, nicknamed "the Pope of Islam" replied:

What is happening in Iran is a political event, a political activity, and that has nothing, but nothing to do with Islam (as a religion). 18

In response to a question about the proclaiming of a jihad against Communism and other enemies of Islam, Imam Al-Haq defined the term in its traditional Islamic meaning:

Quite simply expressed, jihad means finding the true path, rejecting bad habits and bad traditions. The most important meaning of the concept of jihad is to reform oneself and one's spirit by becoming clear about all matters of faith, by convincing oneself and providing others with a good example.

It is good for the people if they are led toward finding the correct approach to the nature of religion and distancing themselves from bad attitudes. Islam is the path. It provides discipline and order for those who have gone astray. It guides people in prayer in the one direction, the true direction which is the Kaaba in Mecca. Sometimes the prayer lasts a whole hour, and it brings with it the duty for all believers to pray together in groups and in mosques. It also lets the people come together once a week for Friday prayer. In addition, twice a year there are prayers for the high holidays and the big meeting during pilgrimage. That is all determined by the goal of assisting people in the comprehension of their religion and in the approach to their religion and of discussing all problems with them. That is, quite simply, jihad in Islam. 19

Despite the emphasis on the spiritual aspects of jihad by Muslim leaders, fundamentalist and militant groups continue to stress the military aspects of the concept. The assassins of Egyptian President Sadat belonged to the Al-Jihad group which adapted an eleven point manifesto for the carrying out of jihad. These points are outlined in a work entitled Al-Jihad:

The Forgotten Pillar by Muhammad Abd al-Salaam Faraj:

- (a) Laws of Muslim countries are not Islamic enough because the leaders have been trained by Christians, Communists or Zionists. Therefore these apostate leaders must be opposed, since apostasy is the greatest of all sinfulness.
- (b) Cooperation with an infidel or apostate ruler is a sin punishable by death.
- (c) True Muslims should refrain from government work or military service in an infidel or apostate state.
- (d) Jihad through peaceful means is cowardly. Armed struggle is the only valid means of jihad and is obligatory for all true Muslims.
- (e) Islamic civilization is in its present state because of the unwillingness of Muslims to wage military jihad.²⁰

Al-Jihad members held that Allah had divided history into five ages. In an eschatological sense they believed their mission was to end the present fourth age and usher in the fifth age when the ummah (Islamic community) would live in a era of peace similar to the reign of the Prophet Muhammed: Allah has designated five periods in Islamic history:

- a. The ummah under the Prophet,
- b. The ummah under the Caliphs,
- c. The ummah under the Kingdoms,
- d. The ummah under dictatorships,
- e. The Islam of the present time when dictatorship and tyranny will be overthrown, and the ummah shall become

controlled by a system similar to the Prophet's community and
21
eschatological peace will reign

The Koran and War

Voices in the Islamic world like Imam Al-Haq have risen to oppose politically-motivated violence in the name of Islam. "I continue to be against the view," he said, "that the path to an Islamic order is unconditionally connected with war, for Islam strictly forbids war and fighting among Muslims." 22 In referring to the murder of Sadat, the Imam again criticized the view that jihad must always involve force:

(The Al-Jihad assassins who killed Sadat in the name of Allah were) absolutely wrong. As I already mentioned, fighting between Muslims is forbidden by Islam. One principle of Islam is good counsel, which is provided by the religion. That applies both for the ruler and or the ruled. The path of force and of killing is forbidden to us. These people took the wrong path when they killed. 23

American Muslims interviewed stated that although the oppressive conditions in the Middle East produce desperate people, the killing of innocents, slaughter of women and children and other acts of terrorisms committed in the name of Islam were not consistent with the tenets of the faith. 24 The Koran clearly describes just conduct during the war and these acts do not fit within Islamic guidelines. The so-called "Islamic terrorists" use terrorism because of:

- (a) Inadequate instruction in the Koran and Islamic principles.
- (b) Poor leadership that is opportunistic and self-serving.

(c) Adaptation of fighting tactics common to their culture but inconsistent with Islam.

(d) Misconceptions about the Islamic idea of martyrdom.²⁵

"Laws of war" and "rules for jihad" are present in the Koran and other books sacred to Islam. The Prophet Muhammed himself is reported to have said: "I am ordered to fight polytheists until they say: 'There is no God but Allah'."²⁶ Muslims are commanded by God to fight, but do not wage wars of aggression for "Allah loves not the aggressors":

And fight in the way of God with those who fight with you, but aggress not: God loves not the aggressors. And slay them (polytheists) wherever you come upon them, and expel them from where they expelled you; persecution is more grievous than slaying. But fight them not by the Holy Mosque until they should fight you there; then, if they fight you, slay them-such is the recompense of unbelievers-but if they give over, surely God is All-forgiving, All-compassionate. Fight them till there is no persecution and the religion is God's; then if they give over, there shall be no enmity save for evildoers. The holy month for the holy month; holy things demand retaliation. Who so commits aggression against you, do you commit aggression against him like as he has committed against you; and fear you God, and know that God is with the godfearing. 27

Like the Hebrews of ancient Israel, Muslims are commanded by God to "slay idolaters wherever you find them" secure in the knowledge that Allah fights with his people:

Then, when the sacred months are drawn away, slay the idolaters wherever you find them, and take them, and confine them, and lie in wait for them at every place of ambush. But if they repent, and perform the prayer, and pay the alms, then let them go their way. Fight them, and God will chastise them at your hands and degrade them, and He will help you against them. 28

Although the jihad is obligatory on all able-bodied Muslims, the Koran does allow for exemptions in Chapter 48:

There is no fault in the blind, and there is no fault in the lame, and there is no fault in the sick. And whosoever obeys God and His Messenger, He will admit him into gardens underneath which rivers flow; but whosoever turns his back, him He will chastise with a painful chastisement. God was well pleased with the believers when they were swearing fealty to thee under the tree, and He knew what was in their hearts, so He sent down the Shechina upon them, and rewarded them with a nigh victory and many spoils to take; and God is ever All-mighty, All-wise. 29

Important rules for Muslims conducting war include:

- (a) Protection of innocent civilians, especially women and children.
- (b) War termination as soon as possible.
- (c) Camp hygiene
- (d) Protection of the environment
- (e) Combatants using force only against other combatants.

30

The requirement to protect the environment, like the one found in Numbers 20: 19-20, means, according to Islamic leadership, that "no true Muslim" can use nuclear, biological or chemical weapons because of the ecological damage such arms would do.

31

Contemporary Islam and War

Research has shown that the Islamic concept of jihad is more spiritual than military. Military jihads may be conducted against polytheists, monotheists, bandits, rebels, or apostates. Fundamental and militant groups within Islam emphasize the military jihad more than the spiritual jihad.

Although the Ayatollah Khomeini said that "the lesser jihad is the struggle against the visible enemy in the battlefield, and the greater or supreme jihad is the ceaseless war man is called upon to wage against his lower self,"³² it is the "lesser jihad" to which Muslims like him are committing their religious, psychological, economic and human resources.

Islam is not unique in scriptures and traditions that justify intolerance, conquest and the use of force to spread a certain point of view. Nor is Islam alone in teaching that its mandate from God is not complete until its religion reaches every corner of the earth. The fear and threat are in a dualistic world view that incites violence before reconciliation. This is embodied in the more extremist views of Islam that are identified as "ideologies of revolutionary violence."³³ A statement by Khomeini is case in point:

By God, whoever does not cry out in protest is a sinner! By God, whoever does not express his outrage commits a major sin! Leaders of Islam, come to the aid of Islam! Ulama of Najaf, come to the aid of Islam! Ulama of Qum, come to the aid of Islam! Islam is destroyed! Muslim peoples! Leaders of the Muslim peoples! Presidents and kings of the Muslim peoples! Come to our aid! Are we to be trampled underfoot by the boots of America simply because we are a weak nation and have no dollars? America is worse than Britain; Britain is worse than America. The Soviet Union is worse than both of them. They are all worse and more unclean than each other! But today it is America that we are concerned with. Let the American President know that in the eyes of the Iranian people, he is the most repulsive member of the human race today because of the injustice he has imposed on our Muslim nation. Today the Qur'an has become his enemy, the Iranian nation has become his enemy. Let the American government know that its name has been ruined and disgraced in Iran. 34

In contrast to Islamic fundamentalism in the Middle East, Islam in the United States has moved from a sectarian movement within the African-American community to a "mainstream religion" within the society.³⁵ Islamic leaders like Wallace D. Muhammed expect Islam to reach the status of the number two religion in the United States within several years.³⁶ To American Muslims jihad is "striving with God-given facilities" to improve self community, nation and world.³⁷ They are encouraged to participate fully in all aspects of American life, including military service.³⁸ "It is the responsibility of the American Muslim," said Imam Amin of the San Diego Masjid (Mosque), "to protect and defend the United States and its Constitution."³⁹ The San Diego Imam provides Islamic services on base for military personnel stationed at the Naval Training Center, Marine Corps Recruit training Depot, the Naval Station and Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton.⁴⁰

In 1989 and 1990 Imam Amin conducted training seminars for US Navy chaplains on Islam in the San Diego area. The issues covered included:

- (a) Facilitation of worship for Muslims ashore and at sea.
- (b) The dietary requirements of Islam.
- (c) Military duty and the flexibility of religious requirements like salat.
- (d) The five pillars of Islam.
- (e) Fundamental beliefs of Islam.
- (f) The differences between the Sunni orthodoxy of the American

Muslim community and the "un-Islamic" religious nationalism of
Minister Louis Farrakhan's movement.⁴¹

In summary, the use of force is considered an obligatory part of Muslim religion, especially when employed in response to oppression. Significantly, military jihad is acceptable only if no other recourse to resistance exists.

Unfortunately, Islamic fundamentalists and militants often view military jihad as the only legitimate means of resisting the rule or influence of non-Muslims.

Not only is Islam growing as a force in international politics, but within the religious, military, political and cultural aspects of life in the United States as well. Most American Muslims are "orthodox" and see no conflict between military service and the tenets of Islam. Islamic worship is regularly facilitated within the armed services for those military personnel who practice the Muslim faith.

CHAPTER VIII ENDNOTES

1. Thomas W. Lippman, Understanding Islam (New York: New American Library, 1982) p. 5.
2. D. S. Roberts, Islam: A Concise Introduction (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1981) pp. 36-39.
3. Eerdman's Handbook to the World's Religions, (Grand Rapids, Mich: 1982) pp. 330-332.
4. Hamid Enayat, Modern Islamic Political Thought (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1982) p. 2.
5. Interview with Imam El-Amin, 20 April 1990 (see Appendix V).
6. Daniel Pipes, In the Path of God (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1983), pp. 43-44.
7. Ibid, p. 44.
8. Ibid, p. 45.
9. Ibid.
10. Ibid.
11. Imam Wallace D. Muhammed, "Al-Islam for African-Americans," Lecture, Masjid Al-Faatir, Chicago, IL: 30 March 1990.
12. Donald Eugene Smith, Religion, Politics and Social Change in the Third World (New York: Free Press, 1971) p. 109.
13. Ibid.
14. Guenter Lewy, Religion and Revolution (New York: Oxford University Press, 1974) pp. 176-193.
15. Ibid, p. 180.
16. Ibid, p. 162.

17. Dietl Wilhelm, Holy War (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1984) p. 115.
18. Ibid, pp. 115-116.
19. Ibid.
20. R. Hrair Dekmejian, Islam in Revolution (Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press, 1985) pp. 100-101.
21. Ibid.
22. Wilhelm, op.cit., p. 117.
23. Ibid.
24. Amin, op.cit.
25. Ibid.
26. Majid Khadduri, War and Peace in the Law of Islam (Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press, 1955) p. 59.
27. Koran 2: 187-190.
28. Koran 9: 5;14.
29. Koran 48: 17-19.
30. Amin, op.cit.
31. Amin op.cit. and Muhammed, op.cit.
32. Ruholla Khomeini, Islam and Revolution (Berkeley: Mizan Press, 1981) p. 429.
33. Martin Kramer (ed.), Shi'ism, Resistance and Revolution (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1987), pp. 47-66.
34. Khomeini, op.cit., pp. 185-186.
35. Muhammed, op.cit.
36. Ibid.
37. Ayesha K. Mustafaa, "Striving with God-given Faculties," Muslim Journal, 11 May 1990, p. 1 and 17.

38. Muhammed, op.cit.
39. Amin, op.cit.
40. Joan Sabree, "For the West Coast, It all Began Here in San Diego," Muslim Journal, 2 March 1990, 3 and 17.
41. Imam Aqueel M. El-Amin, "Al-Islam and the Military" Muslim Journal, p. 9 and 17.

CHAPTER IX

CONCLUSION

The religious traditions studied have well developed views on the use of force. The concerns are related philosophically to the ideas found in the Law of Armed Conflict. Conclusions reached from the research include:

- (a) All religions studied have views on war and military ethics: Each faith studied had ideas on when, why and how war should be conducted. Some of the concepts dated back to the earliest origins of the religions and their scriptures.
- (b) All religions studied, with minor variations, generally view the use of force in the manner: Ideas like peace, reconciliation, the sanctity of life and justice challenge religions to critique violence on the scale of war. Theological issues and human concerns are the criteria.
- (c) All religions studied see the use of military power as a necessary, though regrettable, part of a less than perfect world: Though preventive diplomacy, negotiation, deterrence, nonviolent social change and disarmament are preferred to war, religions realize military force is needed as a "police officer" in an imperfect "City of Man."
- (d) All religions studied generally view war as the last resort of a nation after all other avenues are exhausted: Because of the severity of war, all religions view it as an option to be exercised after diplomatic and political initiatives have failed.

(e) All religions studied view self-defense and humanitarian intervention as the only legitimate just causes for the use of force: Self-defense, including pre-emptive self-defensive strikes in some cases, and intervention to rescue people from oppression or danger are the only just causes considered valid for use of military power. Wars of aggression are sinful in all contemporary religions.

(f) All religions studied realize a need to maintain a balance between the real and the ideal: The highest principles of the faith are always balanced and considered in light of the reality of human society. In an ideal world war would not exist, but in an imperfect world nations need military deterrence and armed forces.

(g) Pacifist and militant extremes exist in all the religions studied: A majority "mainstream" balances each religion on a continuum between militant advocacy of "holy war," war for national glory or war for political purpose on one extreme and absolute pacifism and nonviolence on the other extreme.

(h) All religions studied communicated a willingness to endorse military chaplains: Having chaplains present in the armed forces to facilitate religious expression for their practitioners on active duty was considered an imperative by all leadership interviewed.

(i) All religions studied acknowledge their institutional structures have been the tools of political authorities: The seduction and prostitution of religion for purposes such as aggressive war, crusades, enforcement of state rule and

political control of the population is considered a great sin. Vigilance to prevent "repeat offenses" is considered essential by all religions.

The number of Americans practicing religions from Asian, pre-Christian and non-Judeo-Christian traditions will continue to increase. One reason is the consistent increase of Asian immigrants in the United States. These immigrants, and their descendants, continue to practice historical religions like Islam, Buddhism and Hinduism. Non-immigrant Americans are converting to these religions from Judaism, Christianity and no previous preference. This trend will continue because of the ideas Americans find attractive in the "new" religions. These ideas include:

- (a) The unity of humanity and nature: Human beings are called to live in an organic relationship with nature rather than seek domination over nature.
- (b) The universality of religion: Movement beyond tribal, racial or national identity to "global citizenship" through spirituality.
- (c) Mind, body and spirit unity and female-male integration: Rejection of dualism separating "soma" and "psyche" to instead live as a whole, balanced and integrated person.
- (d) Multiple paths to the truth: Belief that no one religion has a monopoly on spiritual truth and that the road appropriate for one leads to enlightenment.
- (e) Freedom from materialism: Changing focus to finding "security" in spirituality instead of material possessions.

(f) Direct rather than secondary encounter with divinity:

Moving beyond verbalism, dogmatism, nationalism, religiousity and hierarchy to experience the ecstasy of the divine through chanting, meditation, prayer and other spiritual disciplines.

(g) Liberation from sin: Abandoning the ideas of Original Sin, guilt, judgement and sin as anachronisms based on outdated Greek dualism, Augustinian morality, tribal paternalism and medieval feudalism-based political theology.

Although the theologies of Eastern religions transferred well to the United States, the sociology and mythology of the East have not. The democratic ideals of American egalitarianism influenced Asian religions movements in the United States. Despite the hierarchial structures in China, India and Japan, the "new" religions from the East developed a character and social culture more American than Asian. Not only has East influenced West, but West has influenced East.

All religions studied are presently engaged in activity with political or social implications or are considering such social action ministry in the future. Their intellectual influence, prophetic witness and moral approaches to the ethic of force will increasingly impact the uniformed services both from within, through enlisted and officer personnel belonging to the faiths, and from without, through their presence in the American political process.

CHAPTER X

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the research, the increasing religious pluralism of the United States and the armed forces and the growing role of religion in the international environment the author makes the following recommendations for implementation by the U S Navy and other relevant departments of the Department of Defense:

- (a) Officer education: Increase military education on all levels, especially the mid-career level and the PCO/PXO pipeline, on the constitutional, legal, gender, ethnic and ethical implications of religion for the commander.
- (b) Command-level seminars: Institute command-level training, similar to the ethics, sexual harassment prevention and race relationship workshops, on religious freedom, religious pluralism and the rights of individuals to worship the religion of their choice.
- (c) Chaplain Corps: Provide for representation of the "new religions" in the Chaplain Corps of the armed forces.
- (d) Common American heritage: While recognizing the pluralism and diversity of the nation's citizens, highlight the common values, common heritage and common interests of Americans in programs designed to build esprit de corps and patriotism. Celebrations like ecumenical prayer breakfasts, service birthdays, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. commemoration services and POW/MIA recognition days are examples of such department and command level programs that already exist.

APPENDIX I

INTERVIEW WITH DR. NORMAN CHAMBERS

Dr. Norman Chambers is a clinical psychologist, Professor of African-American Studies at San Diego State University and Director of the Multi-Cultural Counseling Center and the Carl Rogers Institute for Psychotherapy, Training and Supervision, both in San Diego, California. In the 1950s he served as a Medical Corpsman in the United States Navy. The interview took place in his home on 19 April 1990.

Leslie: What role does religion play in the psychology of people in war?

Chambers: Religion, of course, plays a role in the culture of individuals and nations. Many of the people I counsel are religious or spiritual in one way or another. It is particularly interesting to observe the interaction of religions and cultures in California. This is the first multi-cultural and multi-ethnic state in the USA. Soon white people will be a minority in California. How one relates to the spiritual and the divine determines how one relates to other human beings. Unfortunately, in conflicts involving religion the intensity of warfare is increased, as well as the "us" versus "them" quality of the war.

Leslie: In what way?

Chambers: Many religions are dualistic, casting the world in terms of black and white with no allowance for grays. Those who are fighting for the nation, with the blessing of the religion, are part of the elect of God. The enemy are not

only outside the national groups, they are outside of the chosen people of God. Religion has an influence on the psyche of the warrior. Normally it is not acceptable to kill another human being. Religion brings legitimacy to conducting violence on behalf of the state or elect group. The killing of people on a large scale is not only legitimate in war, but required. Thus, an attitude develops that morals and ethics are only for the in-group. The morality of the in-group's religion does not extend to the enemy in the out-group.

Leslie: Thus the enemy is dehumanized into "gooks," "Commies" or "imperialists?"

Chambers: Definitely. The enemy is defined as less than human, sub-human, in some kind of way. Then killing is not only acceptable and justifiable, but laudable. Throughout history religions have told warriors that the more enemy soldiers they kill the greater their reward in the afterlife. Also, they are told, if they die in battle the rewards in the next world will be great indeed. Religion helps one order their world. In war, religion reinforcing the state ideology, makes one believe they are fighting not only for the glory of the nation, but the very cosmic order itself. What better way to live, fight or die? The religion will determine the psyche of the nation and the individual. People and groups draw great inner strength from their religious beliefs. That spiritual energy can be directed towards positive and constructive efforts like achieving goals in life or working for peace in the world. The work of people like Mother

Teresa, Dr. King and the Dalai Lama are good examples of this kind of religion. However, as we have already discussed spiritual energy in human beings can be directed towards results that are negative and destructive. Holy wars, jihads, crusades and inquisitions can be engaged in against people declared less than godly or even less than human. The murder of women, the torture of Jews and Moors, the slavery of Africans, the slaughter of South American Indians and the conversion of peoples by the sword were all justified throughout history on religious grounds.

Leslie: Thank you for your time.

Chambers: You're welcome.

APPENDIX II

INTERVIEW WITH DR. GAYE SWENSON AND MS. VANDA OSMON

Dr. Gaye Swenson is the Director of the Carl Rogers Institute for Person-Centered Approaches to Peace named after its founder. Ms. Vanda Osmon is a researcher and consultant on women's issues and earth religions. The interview took place 19 April 1990 at the office of the Carl Rogers Institute in La Jolla, California.

Leslie: What is women's spirituality?

Osmon: Women's spirituality is rooted in the earth-based religions and Goddess religions that were once the basis for the world-wide religion and culture of peoples before the domination of patriarchy. The central ideas have strains that run through all the world's religions in one manner or another. This is my perspective.

Swenson: Prehistoric peoples also honored the mysteries of the female. Women were seen as goddesses, as holy spirits, because of all the miracles of the woman's body that could not be explained. Women bleed, yet did not die, every month. Women gave birth to children and produced food, breast milk, for them from their bodies. That life was created in the woman's body and nurtured by it was celebrated as a holy, esoteric mystery in earliest times.

Leslie: Prehistoric and ancient cultures worshipped the feminine principles then?

Swenson: Yes, and women had responsibilities of religious

leadership later reserved only for men. Women lead the community in worship as priestesses, for example, and officiated at burial rites.

Osmon: The Iroquois women, for example, in their culture not only were nurturers and caretakers of the culture, but exercised the power of selecting and removing from office, the chief of the tribe. In pre-patriarchal societies religious leadership and political leadership were exercised by women. In our times today women's spirituality is having a positive impact on the political and religious world. A deeper men's spirituality is growing in response to women's spirituality. That's only one example, of course. Starhawk recently spoke here on the need to balance the male and the female aspects of spirituality in ourselves and relationships. She emphasized that not only females are the caretakers of the spiritual.

Leslie: How does Goddess spirituality look at war?

Osmon: In earliest times, say 6,000 years back or more, archaeological evidence shows beautiful cities without fortifications.

Swenson: The Goddess cultures date back at least 25,000 years. Osmon: Yes, that's true. These societies had no weapons of war.

Swenson: The Minoan civilization on Crete was an example of a Goddess-orientated culture late in history.

Osmon: The evidence is that ancient societies and prehistoric cultures lived in peace and harmony. War did not exist for a long time in human history.

Swenson: Around 6,000 years ago successive waves of invading peoples from desolate lands to the North began invading and conquering Goddess cultures in Europe, the Middle East, Asia and northern Africa. Their harsh environment had made these nomads, the Aryans or Indo-Europeans, war-like and aggressive. These invaders destroyed or assimilated the native culture, enslaved the women and indigenous peoples and established religious-political social orders based on male domination and war.

Leslie: So war originated in the Aryan invasions and their patriarchal cultures?

Osmon: Yes. War, the desire to dominate women and other peoples and male domination are all inter-related. The over-glorification of the male side of aggressiveness is the root of war and a desire of one people to exploit and dominate another.

Swenson: Unfortunately Western society has suppressed or ridiculed the female principle of intuitiveness and the ancient spirituality of women. Whenever it surfaces in Western culture it is violently oppressed. For example, its appearance in the Middle Ages led to the massive campaigns of murder and terror against women...the so-called witch hunts. Because the patriarchy glorified the male, men cut off themselves from intuition, spirituality and other aspects of the feminine principle except in the mysticism movements and fringes.

Leslie: Are all wars merely campaigns for conquest and domination or is there such a thing as a just war?

Osmon: I personally do not feel any war is justified because of the sanctity of human life. Every human life is sacred and we have gotten away from realizing how sacred every life is.

If we are to survive as a species we must realize this.

However, in the real world if some power came to dominate and rape my family and community the activist in me would want to protect. I would not want to pick up a gun, but I would want to protect those I love. I guess I really don't have an answer to the question of just war or a just cause.

Swenson: If we can develop a political and economic system in the world based on negotiation and reconciliation, rather than the extremes of domination, hierarchy and patriarchy on one hand and appeasement and acquiescence to evil on the other war can become unnecessary. Strong assertion of humane values in a global community can prevent the conditions that give birth to leaders like Hitler that wars are waged against. If I believe that human beings are caretakers of other human beings, the Earth and all life, my attitude is a lot different than in an intellectual, economic and political system where the governing values are exploitation, power, authority and domination. The lesser values based on dominating lead to war. The higher values based on cooperating lead to peace.

Leslie: It takes time for values to change in a culture.

Swenson: Sure. In the 1960s your patriotism was suspect if you were in the peace movement. Now twenty years later peace ideas are in the social and political mainstream. The same is true of the ecology movement two decades ago. Now as the

twentieth anniversary of Earth Day approaches this weekend we can see the consciousness of environmental issues has also entered the mainstream. It is possible to make value shifts in culture much more rapidly than in the past. The media and the age of technology, communications and information we live in makes this possible.

Leslie: How can women's spirituality help this value shift?

Swenson: By offering alternative values to change or moderate the contemporary emphasis on patriarchy rather than partnership, competition rather than cooperation, hierarchy rather than equality and domination rather than nurturing. We can learn that working together is better than going to war.

Leslie: What about the belief that people are by nature aggressive and will seek to dominate or make war?

Swenson: What separates Carl Rogers from a psychologist like Freud is he believed human beings were basically good and want to nurture, create and grow. I do not believe people are basically evil. I believe evil people are the exception not the norm. We can no longer build our political and economic systems to be based on the exception of the person who wants to do harm rather than the rule of the person who wants to do good. I believe the principles inherent in feminine spirituality and the Person-Centered Approach, empathy, unconditional love, authenticity and the rest can grow in value in the world and help facilitate a social order built less on war and more on cooperation. It will, in my opinion, grow out of necessity.

Osmon: In addition to Gaye's comments there is in Goddess

spirituality the tradition of Athena. She is the warrior goddess who was born from the head of her father Zeus fully adult and armored. Athena was the patron deity of the enlightened democratic Greek city-state Athens. For many women she symbolizes the assertive aspect of womanhood. Assertive and protective, but not aggressive and dominating. Athena symbolizes the activist spirit for some women.

Swenson: We need more men and women, like Gandhi and Dr. King, willing to be assertive for the truth. We need both men and women, but since patriarchal culture values the male voice more than the female voice we need men to speak up very much. I see this type of leadership growing more. I would like to see it more in the political and spiritual arena. When more nations solve their problems in a non-violent manner, like the changes in Eastern Europe since last year, then violence within countries and between states will gradually decrease. We must model another way.

Leslie: I see how you believe violence is inter-related on the individual, family, national, global and spiritual level.

Swenson: One who considers it acceptable to use violence to control women, children and other races finds no trouble projecting violence into relations between nations or the relations between humanity and nature.

Leslie: Thank you both for your time.

Swenson: You're welcome

Osmon: You're welcome

APPENDIX III

Interview with Ted Kardesh

Ted Kardesh has been an ordained Taoist priest since 1986.

The interview take place at the Taoist Sanctuary of San Diego on 19 April 1990, in San Diego, California.

Leslie: How does Taoism look at the reality of War?

Kardesh: According to the Tao Te Ching, the basic works of Taoism, war is treated as something that is a necessity which arises in human society. Taoism does not take a definitive moral view on war. It is an amoral philosophy. As in nature, there is no morality, no preset system of values and judgements in Taoism. Leslie: As in nature?

Kardesh: Yes. One example given often is that of the river. The river can provide fertile crop soil to the land and be used as a means of transportation. However, the river can also flood and wipe out homes and destroy crops. So the river does not have a moral point of view. In Taoism there is a desirable point of view. The desirable point of view is to follow the way of nature. Nature is harmonious and in balance with itself. Thus, in Taoism, an ideal society would have no war, no exploitation or no pretense. It would have a hierarchy that was accepted by all and worked for the benefit of all. In the Tao Te Ching, though, there are references to war and conduct during combat.

Leslie: Could you share a few of the references with me?

Kardesh: In chapter 31 it says war is a time for sadness not rejoicing. When a victory is won it is also an occasion for

sadness. Chapter 68 talks about how a good warrior does not get lost in emotion. "A skillful fighter does not feel anger." A fighter does only what needs to be done. Partaking of violent exchange between peoples is sad.

Leslie: Is war considered part of the yin-yang interaction?

Kardesh: Yes. Taoism is based on the idea that all manifestations are made up of two types of energy or opposing forces. The challenge for human beings is to learn to find harmony and balance within the interaction between yin and yang. At times, of course, finding harmony and balance does not happen. If you are caught in this imbalance manifested as war you participate. Though that is what you do, you must keep the big picture. Still, one would fight to win because one believed they were fighting on the right side. At the same time, on another level, one would lament this folly called war that human beings engage in.

Leslie: Thus war results from a failure to live in balance and harmony with the Tao?

Kardesh: Exactly. Wanting things. Desiring things. Being attached to things. Desiring to exercise power instead of letting things run their natural course. Desiring another's land or property. Desiring to exercise one's ego in a destructive way. These things lead to disharmony, imbalance and war.

Leslie: So in Taoism a "just war" is only striking back in self-defense to restore a balance?

Kardesh: Exactly. If the invading force is great one must

respond. Our Tai-Chi master here at the Taoist sanctuary, Abraham Lui, was a general in the army of the Chinese Nationalists. He fought against the Chinese Communists during the Civil War until 1949. In the earliest stages the Nationalists were well organized and well-equipped. The Communists, on the other hand, were guerillas conducting a guerilla-style war. Lui likes to explain that the Communists won because they used Tai-Chi tactics. They were able to lure in the Nationalists opponents by yielding at the appropriate time and not being there when the opponent attacked. Sun Tzu in The Art of War says that the most successful war is the war won without fighting...without picking up arms. However, if one must fight, there are certain principles deriving from Taoism or the Tao which helps one to win. One principle is know the enemy and know yourself. One must be aware of the strengths and weaknesses of both your foe and your self. Then the strategies and battle plans are based on that knowledge.

Leslie: What is another principle?

Kardesh: Knowledge allows you to outguess your enemy. Awareness of the enemy means you will know what he is about to do. When the enemy attacks foreknowledge will allow you to absorb your foe's energy and direct it back against him. When an enemy attacks give. When the enemy has exhausted their force then you attack. In order to be victorious one must know how to yield, absorb and re-direct an enemy's force.

Leslie: This is a Taoist style of fighting?

Kardesh: Yes, Abraham Lui reminds us that the Chinese

Communists did and any guerilla does fight with these tactics. A guerilla disappears into the jungle, knowing the land well and using it to hide and using the terrain to outmaneuver the less flexible and heavier government armed forces. Sun Tzu's writings absolutely reflect a Taoist approach to war.

Leslie: Then, it is possible to be a "superior man" in the sense of Chinese religion and philosophy and still be a warrior?

Kardesh: Yes, that is my belief. If one follows their destiny in a historical context participating in war it is still possible to possess the qualities of a superior man such as detachment, service to one's cause and being fully in the moment. Of course, under other circumstances a superior man may choose not to fight. A superior man who chooses to fight may do so because the need to balance opposing forces is perceived.

Leslie: Can you give me an example?

Kardesh: I think the Second World War is a good example. There is normally a general consensus that this a war that had to be fought. Nazi Germany forces represented an imbalance that had to be countered. Military personnel went willingly to fight. The Vietnam War, however, did not share the same consensus in America as a war that was necessary and had to be fought. Different choices were made about both wars.

Leslie: So a Taoist makes an individual decision of conscience? There is no uniform position for Taoist?

Kardesh: Yes, each person makes their own decision. The decision would change as the circumstances would change. I once saw a documentary on the life of Japan's Admiral Yamamota. During the 1920s and 1930s he foresaw war for Japan and did not want to fight the United States. However, once the die was cast, he went to war with a heavy heart. Such was his view of duty in a sense similar to one Taoist view. If one is caught in the imbalance of war one must usually fight.

Leslie: I remember in my own reading of the Tao Te Ching warnings against glorification of violence in war.

Kardesh: Yes. Take part, but with a heavy heart, like Admiral Yamamota, not glorifying in the violence. Soldiers in the Taoist tradition speak of "playing the guest" and "being like water." Yielding like water and nature, yielding to change, is characteristic of the Tao. These same principles are applied to warfare as in the military saying "I dare not advance an inch, but would rather withdraw a foot" in chapter 69 of the Tao Te Ching.

Leslie: I can see how Taoist ideas influenced Sun Tzu.

Kardesh: Capturing the enemy without attacking, being armed without weapons and taking a stance in life discouraging others from attacking you, for example, are ideas found in the Tao Te Ching that were applied to warfare. One's energy puts others on notice that they are not to be trifled with and discourages attack. Taoism teaches non-striving because life will guide us. We must be ready with the energy necessary to follow life's calling, which, may be for some, to serve as a

warrior. But still, you do not glorify in doing violence, but carry out your duty with reverent sorrow in you heart.

Leslie: Was Taoism the foundation of the martial arts in China?

Kardesh: Absolutely. The code of the martial artist is to avoid rather than check, check rather than hurt, hurt rather than maim, maim rather than kill. If one must kill, then so be it. A Taoist would not be aggressive but would act in self-defense moving up the spectrum of violence from check to kill as necessary. A Taoist puts all their energy where its necessary. Tao includes everything even war. Nature itself is sometimes violent as in the flooding of the river and animals who fight each other. Generally though war is considered absence of harmony with the Tao and peace is harmony with Tao.

Leslie: Goddess religion practioners believe the Tao is a Chinese manifestation of the Great Mother or Great Goddess. Do you agree?

Kardesh: The yin is considered a feminine principle and the yang is considered a male principle. Throughout the Tao Te Ching the Tao is referred to as "the Mother", "the Mother of All Things", "the female" and the "Mother of the world." I agree with the Goddess women about the Tao as a feminine receptive force. In the past 5,000 years there has been an emphasis on the yang principle because we live in a patriarchal culture. Because of this imbalance we need to

return more to the feminine receptive side and restore more of a balance. I think we see this in the world today.

Leslie: Thank you for your time.

Kardesh: Your welcome.

APPENDIX IV

INTERVIEW WITH DRUTAKARMA

Drutakarma is an educator, writer and editor with the International Society for Krishna Consciousness (ISKN), commonly know as the Hare Krishna Movement. The interview took place at the Hare Krishna Temple in the Pacific Beach community of San Diego, California on 20 April 1990.

Leslie: How does Hinduism look at war and the use of force?

Drutakarma: Hinduism, like Christianity, includes a variety of spiritual paths and religious expressions. Our faith traces its origins to our Scriptures like the Bhagavad-Gita. ISKN relates to the Bhagavad-Gita. It speaks of different social groups like the brahmas and kshatriyas. The brahmas are spiritual leaders and teachers, like priest or scientists today. Normally, they are non-violent and not partake in fighting, like conscientious objectors today. The kshatriyas on the other hand are administrators and warriors. They were expected to use violence for a just cause such as upholding laws, defending nations and protecting others. War, however, must be justified.

Leslie: Who would define the war as just?

Drutakarma: The Scriptures basically outline what is just war. Essentially fighting is justified in self-defense and the protection of religious principles. The military were born and trained to be warriors. Combat involved certain rules. It only took place between opposing groups of professional military forces.

Leslie: So no "citizens-in-arms" in Hinduism?

Drutakarma: No. Our concept of war does not include the targeting of civilians like in a nuclear missile launch that hits cities and kills millions of people. That would not be accepted as just.

Leslie: What about the great wars described in the Bhagavad-Gita?

Drutakarma: Those were between the professional soldiers, the kshatriyas, who fought on battlefields away from the civilian populations. There were rules of conduct during war. The military forces only fought during the day. At night they would return to their camps, or even visit each other. They shared a code of chivalry like the knights of medieval Europe and the first military airplane pilots of World War One. The role of the kshatriyas in society was to be the warrior class. The other social groups include people like business persons and laborers. In the ideal Vedic civilization only the kshatriyas would wage war. It is their nature. Unlike, say the United States during the draft, when all young men were expected to fight whether it was their nature or not.

Leslie: How is the ISKN Temple community organized?

Drutakarma: In the Temple community we basically train brahmas, non-violent teachers and spiritual leaders. Although brahmas can teach anything, like the military arts, they are not expected to engage in combat themselves. Our founder, when he first came to the United States, gained conscientious objector status for our Temple members explaining that they

were training to be brahmas or priests. However, we understand the nations need police forces and militaries. These forces, according to the Bhagavad-Gita, must be governed by certain principles. They are for defending lives, not only human life, but in accordance with our religion, animal life as well. The government must be just living in harmony with spiritual principles.

Leslie: Are congregational members, living outside the brahma-training in the Temple, in the military?

Drutakarma: Yes, we have ISKN members, and members of other Hindu traditions, in the military. We would like to see Hindu chaplains in the military one day soon. Brahmas could serve in that capacity. Members who follow the Krishna religion in the Army, Air Force, Navy and the Marine Corps are part of our San Diego community. Other Hindu traditions also worship at our Temple here. We hope to have an educational institution which will one day train the professions. For example, kshatriyas would be educated in the political and military arts. Now we only train brahmas.

Leslie: So non-brahma members would not be conscientious objectors?

Drutakarma: The Krishna religion is concerned that all militaries operate with principles consistent with our faith. Conscientious objection is an individual choice. We have had military personnel convert to our religion and realize theirs is not a kshatriya nature. Some have been discharged on the basis of conscientious objection. However, if one chooses to

remain that is fine. Difficulties may develop in the observance of religious practices. Diet is a concern, for example, since we are vegetarians. Military service is essentially an individual choice. We are concerned about how military force is used since we agree that nations have a right to have militaries and exercise self-defense. Our concern would be with wars of aggression and policies that encourage slaughter and indiscriminate use of force against civilians like strategic bombing during the Second World War. Also, we take issue with Communist and totalitarianist regimes using military forces to oppress and murder their own people. Communist militaries enforce atheism on their own citizens. Militaries should be used to defend religious freedom and God consciousness instead of being used for killing Jews like Hitler did or imposing an atheistic system like the Soviet Union and China did.

Leslie: The moral and ethical concerns seem clear enough.

Drutakarma: A lot of these issues have not been necessarily worked out and systematized by our movement. Since we are international in nature that is difficult to do. As time goes on I think we will do so. I, myself, have been a member since 1973. I joined at the Berkeley Temple. I am a writer and edit some of our publications.

Leslie: Some of your members told me you come from a military family.

Drutakarma: My father was a pilot who served in the Second World War, Korea, and Vietnam. My brother is a reserve pilot

in the Air Force. I grew up on military bases and liked it. Krishna Consciousness teaches the principle of service, such as service to God. I always appreciated the principles of service and sacrifice that the military taught and practiced. The likelihood that one must place their life on the line and the requirement that one must be ready to move anywhere at a moment's notice inspires sacrifice and service. This, of course, is different from other professions in society. These military values are also relevant to the spiritual life. One must sacrifice and serve in order to be a spiritual servant. I was drawn to Krishna Consciousness because of these principles and my personal interest in Eastern philosophy. I always wanted to be a writer also. Thus, I'm able to fulfill both my spiritual and professional interests.

Leslie: Thank you.

Drutakarma: You're welcome.

APPENDIX V

INTERVIEW WITH IMAM AQUEEL AMIN

Imam Amin is the spiritual leader of the American Muslim congregation located in the Southeast community of San Diego. The interview took place in his office on 20 April 1990. Imam Amin also conducts worship services for Islamic military personnel at Naval Training Station, San Diego and Marine Corps Recruit Training Depot, San Diego.

Leslie: How did you find Islam?

Amin: I came into what was then called the Nation of Islam in 1973. I was seeking a spiritual alternative to traditional Christianity. Islam attracted me. After several invitations I finally visited the Muslim temple. Coincidental, the teacher taught a lesson on Adam and Eve. He answered some concerns about Adam I had held for a while. Finally, after several more visits, I joined. By the will of Allah I have been active since then.

Leslie: What are the beliefs of Islam about war and the use of force?

Amin: Using force is appropriate any time the Muslim suffers aggression. Aggression can be psychological as well as physical. Muslims are to remain patient, but our faith does not have a "turn the other cheek" philosophy. The Koran teaches not to respond to aggression beyond the level that one has suffered aggression themselves. For example, if someone seizes two acres of your property, you are allowed only to reclaim by force you own two acres. You should not then seize

two acres of you aggressor's property. You should only restore the status quo. Also there is a concern in Islam that war not damage the ecological balance. The Prophet Muhammed, peace be upon him, instructed us never to destroy the environment such as trees, crops, plant life and other sources of food. Muslims are instructed to take great care in preserving the flora during war. I believe this is a unique attitude, especially when one looks at the use of defoliant agents, like Agent Orange, during wars. Such a practice would not be part of a war conducted according to the tenets of Islam.

Leslie: What does Islam say about treatment of non-combatant personnel?

Amin: Basically Islam says military forces should only engage military forces. In war, great care should be taken to protect women and children. Random use of force is prohibited in Islam. If significant civilian loss would result from striking a enemy force, one is expected to adjust the strategy in light of this. This is, of course, unlike the Israelis who claim to be striking a specific military target, but always causes a civilian loss of life, limb and property in air raids. If, as sometimes happens in war, civilians are killed or injured, then compensation. Islamic nations must pay restitution if this happens. The Muslim is called to conduct war in a civilized manner. One may ask how can war be civilized? Well, Muslims are not to be extreme in the use of force.

Leslie: Can you give me an example?

Amin: Under the rule of Saladin medical aid was given to the wounded king of enemy forces in one battle. Islam also instructs soldiers to maintain hygiene on the field. In history enemy forces even adapted Muslim hygiene techniques. Civilized behavior in war is mandated by Islam.

Leslie: What about terrorist acts committed in the name of Islam?

Amin: Much of the terrorism that is committed in the world is done out of desperation. These people are not also fighting within the context of war addressed by Islam. Terrorists are made not born. Circumstances of extreme oppression creates terrorists. Islam teaches us that oppression is worst then slaughter. Our faith teaches to fight oppression than to live under it and be unable to fulfill you God-ordained potential.

Leslie: So if one is a Muslim fighting oppression it is alright to place aside the normal Islamic tenets of conducting war?

Amin: No. But, unfortunately some fighters against oppression are inadequately informed about the principles of Islam in relation to appropriate use of force. Too many tactics of resistance have been adapted from the culture of the colonialist and the culture of the area rather than the conduct of war taught by Islam. They are emulating their colonialist oppressor. These are cultural factors, not religious factors.

Leslie: So Islam does not condone terrorists walking into an

airport and indiscriminately shooting down women and children?

Amin: No. That is definitely not an Islamic practice. Such behavior is motivated by frustration, desperation, lack of proper leadership and a misguided sense of martyrdom.

Leslie: Misguided?

Amin: They felt that any form of dying, even doing harm to others, in the name of Allah will result in an instant reward of Paradise at death. This is a misguided understanding of the concept. Unfortunately, these people feel that such tactics are necessary because of the extreme oppression they are suffering and no aid from the so-called Muslim world.

Leslie: So-called Muslim world?

Amin: God's law for governing nations is the Sharia. There are no nations that are true and pure Islamic nations. Some nations have Sharia principles in their laws, but are not pure Islamic states. It is said that the pure Islamic state only lasted about 30 years after the death of the Prophet Muhammed. Factionalism grew after that. Our spiritual leader and teacher, W. D. Muhammed, is seeking to lead us through and evolutionary process that may take generations back to a society based on the Sharia.

Leslie: Are there extreme actions of terrorism crimes under Islam law?

Amin: Well, under Islamic law such things as intent and motivation are taken into consideration. For example, under the Sharia a thief does not always have his hand cut off. If social conditions or circumstances of poverty forced one to

steal food to keep from starving then such a severe punishment is not required. Unlike in Western society, sentences are not applied across the board. Since the Western world does not respond to the oppression of Palestinians in the occupied territories or Africans in South Africa it is no surprise these victims resort to violence. All violence used against oppression should not be called "terrorism" by the West. These victims have no other recourse. That is different than a person who commits murder from a corrupt heart with evil intent. Such a murderer deserves a different sentence than a fighter against oppression.

Leslie: Can a Muslim be a conscientious objector despite the command by Allah to fight?

Amin: Yes. The conscience of the individual is a principle respected to the utmost in Islam. Every human being is sacred. Every soul is sacred. Conscientious objection can be weighted, considered and granted in our faith. We are taught, however, by our spiritual leader W. D. Muhammed that as citizens of the United States we are obligated to defend the Constitution and our nation. Conscientious objection must be spiritually-based not politically-based. Simply saying I'm anti-government or anti-American so I don't want to fight in a war is an unacceptable position for an American Muslim. As citizens we have an obligation to serve and defend the United States of America.

Leslie: Are there ethical differences for a Muslim engaged in a regular war for the state and holy war, a jihad for the

faith?

Amin: The term "jihad" means striving. War is only one kind of striving. The most important jihad is the war within the individual against spiritual corruption. The term "holy war" is really inappropriate. Since there is no separation between politics and religion in Islam a Muslim always engages in a war that is holy.

Leslie: How do Muslims decide if a war is just or unjust?

Amin: By the consensus of the people, their religious leadership or their elected or legitimate representatives of the people. Decisions are reached by consensus in Islam. For example, although the Israeli government refuses to recognize the Palestine Liberation Organization the general consensus of the Palestinian people is that the PLO is their legitimate representative.

Leslie: So an Islamic people or their representative reach a consensus amongst themselves about whether the use of force is justifiable?

Amin: Yes. To fight against oppression, whether military, political or economic, is a just cause for a Muslim.

Leslie: What if two Muslim nations fight each other as in the Iran-Iraq War?

Amin: Well, Iraq is ruled by the Ba'athist Party. It is not really a Muslim state. As I already noted there are no pure Islamic states in the world, although Iran, despite its Shi'ite label, comes the closest to a nation governed by principles of the Koran. Labels are superficial anyway. Many

so-called Muslim states merely use Islam for their own political purposes. As our spiritual leader W. D. Muhammed has said some so-called Muslim nations need chastisement.

Leslie: It is appropriate to use force for chastisement?

Amin: If one needs to act in self-defense against aggression it is indeed. All Islamic wars have been in defense of our faith. If one seeks to keep Muslims from propagate their fight they must fight for the right to spread their religion.

Leslie: How are American Muslims in the US military faring.

Amin: Very well. I am very complimentary of the Navy and the Marine Corps for whom I conduct Islamic services. Both services have bent over backwards to accommodate and facilitate every need of the religious practice of Muslims in uniform. We hope to have Muslim chaplains one day soon.

Leslie: Thank you.

Amin: You're welcome.

APPENDIX VI

INTERVIEW WITH THE REVEREND MADELON-WHEELER-GIBB

The Rev. Madelon-Wheeler Gibb is pastor of Arcadia congregational Church, United Church of Christ, in Arcadia, California. She also is the spiritual director of "Mirror Bright Mind" a retreat movement within the UCC Southern California Conference that takes an eclectic approach using a variety of spiritual paths in facilitating deeper personal spirituality. The interview took place in her church office on 21 April 1990.

Leslie: As a Christian minister and spiritual leader how do you feel spiritual paths view war?

Wheeler-Gibb: Violence takes many forms. It can involve ignoring, ridiculing, burning at the stake, excommunicating and other acts of spiritual genocide and spiritual apartheid. Unfortunately the Church as an institution in history and culture has waged war against others. What I call "psychic justice" requires that the Church recover some things it has lost in the past, like spirituality and what it means to be human as it is represented in Jesus. This also requires the Church to be a positive force for equality of ethnicity, race and gender and other people-centered values.

Leslie: What is spiritual apartheid and how does it lead to war?

Wheeler-Gibb: Like racial apartheid, spiritual apartheid promotes a sense of separateness between groups and implies the superiority of one "chosen" group. Just as the spirit of

democracy informs how we look at people in America it must inform how we look at spirituality. Religion must be inspired by the spirit of democracy. In a recent television program Bill Moyers interviewed Steven Ruckerfeller, of the super-rich Ruckerfeller family, who is a college professor and a Buddhist. During the interview Ruckerfeller spoke about concepts discussed in his recent book. One important idea was how there are moral black holes in our spiritual lives because men and women have outgrown the tribal religions we adhere to. Whether people want to realize it or not today we are not just national citizens we are global citizens, members of a global village. Unfortunately, tribal religion conflicts with our contemporary global reality. The values of tribal religion encourage separateness centered on the concept of a pure, elite and elect group of "saved" people. These outdated tribal values are confronting our contemporary global reality. We are no longer separate from each other even if we wanted to be. This conflict causes tremendous pressure and confusion for people. Bridges are being built between religions, races and peoples, but it is a time of great tension for us. Even as we practice these religions built on tribal values, we know in our hearts we have outgrown them and we seek a spirituality consistent with this time of global community. Steven Ruckerfeller was saying in this very fascinating interview that religion is the bridge that will eventually help unite us. The type of inclusion that is part of political democracy must become part of religion. Religion must stop straining

people who possess a global consciousness with practices consistent with the tribal past. Religion must adopt both a consciousness and system of practices that are global in nature.

Leslie: This tribal mentality in religion leads to violence?

Wheeler-Gibb: Yes, tribal mentalities lead to violence of people against people, nation against nation, religion against religion. My primary concern is with religions relating to each other peacefully and developing spiritual paths with a democratic, inclusive and global basis.

Leslie: In a global community, of course, everyone is a neighbor.

Wheeler-Gibb: Exactly. I am called by the covenant of my own local church to love God and love my neighbor as myself. Who is my neighbor in Arcadia? My neighbor in Arcadia is Asian and Buddhist. What is Arcadia Congregational Church going to do? Are we going to be members of a little, tribal, white ethnic church? This church will be a minority congregation in ten more years. We must be a house of prayer for all nations. If so, we can not only sit in the church and chant Jesus to the exclusion of our neighbors.

Leslie: Religion with a sense of global responsibility will cease to be a catalyst for war?

Wheeler-Gibb: The desire to be inclusive is what salvation, conversion, regeneration and nirvana are all about. The kingdom of God is within us and something we have to build now on earth. The concepts of heaven and hell can get us stuck in

seeking our own little personal American world of bliss like a bumper sticker I saw that said "don't bother me I'm living happily ever after." We need to outgrow tribal ideas we are stuck in and reach for God who is calling our name. My sermon this week is on Mary. In the scripture lesson Mary mistakes Jesus for a gardener. You see, the Risen Lord looks like a gardener working in plants in the earth. The only way she finally recognizes him is when Jesus calls Mary by name. Then Mary realizes it is Jesus and that the Resurrection has taken place.

Leslie: And how do you interpret that?

Wheeler-Gibb: Well, in the salvation experience we first mistake Jesus for someone else. We only recognize Jesus for the cosmic archetype he is, and then experience salvation, when we hear God call our name. When we hear our name called we must discover the purpose that God has for us. Christ will call us, if we respond, beyond himself as he said he would. Although Christians are uncomfortable with the idea of being called by Christ beyond Christ he said in the Gospel of John that greater things than he did we will do. Jesus calls us not to be servants, but friends. There is a radical difference between the relationship of a servant and the relationship of a friend. Friendship means equality and servanthood means dependency. Many of us still want to be in the position of victim and the state of dependency. God calls us to growth and responsibility. When God calls we must respond in relationship. To fail to do so is committing

spiritual suicide.

Leslie: And true religion with a global consciousness leads one to alternatives to war?

Wheeler-Gibb: Yes. The first act of spiritual peace is to respond to God when called. All of us are called, but some pretend not to hear their name on the lips of God, because they are afraid, and turn their backs. Failure to respond, grow and include leads to acts of violence. Without the depth of spiritual strength men like Mahatma Gandhi and Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. could not seek non-violent solutions for change. It is spiritual strength that keeps one going.

Nelson Mandela and Father Peter, a Benedictine priest I know imprisoned by the Chinese Communists for over two decades with his hands tied behind his back, are examples of that. People like this have an incredible wealth of peace, dignity and strength. This is real power, not violence. Goddess religion, feminism and other spiritual paths are seeking to give us new ways to define power. Power comes in different ways. Although patriarchal religion says power comes from being separate and dominate, Goddess spirituality says power comes from being related and equal. The Eastern traditions, Gandhi, Dr. King and others have taught this also.

Leslie: Since a desire to be separate and dominate leads to war, a desire to be related and democratic leads to peace?

Wheeler-Gibb: Exactly. We are all brothers and sisters related in humanity. We share common ancestry in a genetic pool going back to our original parents in prehistoric Africa.

only the sun has decided that you have more melanin in your skin as a Black man than I have as a white woman. The mystical tradition within Christianity, which has often been violently suppressed, taught that there is no separation between human being and God or human being and human being. Once this view is successful then all the denominations will claim it, just like the Methodists, Presbyterians and United Church folks are all arguing now over which one had the first ordained woman minister.

Leslie: Isn't that always the case?

Wheeler-Gibb: It's like the award-winning hockey player who says he scores every game because he goes to where the puck will be rather than going to where it is. Just like Native Americans teach their children to shoot arrows where the rabbit will be, rather than where it is. The arrow and the rabbit meet in time and space and then you have dinner through an incredible sense of timing. The Church must aim for where things will be rather than where things are now. For once the non-dualistic spirit of the East meets the spirit of social change in liberal American Protestant Churches there will be a marriage that will result in a new birth. Arnold Toynbee predicted that the thing to watch in the Twenty-first century will be the marriage, the interaction of Buddhism and Christianity. A new consciousness, a nativity unlike we've ever seen, will be born. Patriarchal separation and domination, which encourages violence, war and spiritual apartheid will become a thing of the past replaced by values

like it says in Jerimalah 31:22. In this passage God speaks of creating something so new on earth its like a woman protecting a man. That, of course, is the opposite of perceived power in a patriarchal system. Men "protect" women. But the new nativity will give birth to a redefining of power and values and life, reflecting the Tao, the Great Mother of all Things will be fulfilled in a new world of spiritual non-violence and spiritual democracy.

Leslie: Thank you for your time.

Wheeler-Gibb: You're welcome. I hope it helped your research.

APPENDIX VII

INTERVIEW WITH DR. ALAN BLOOM

Dr. Alan Bloom is the Dean of the Institute for Buddhist Studies in Berkeley, California. The IBS is the seminary for the training of clergy for the Buddhist Churches of America, the largest and oldest Buddhist denomination in the United States. The interview took place in his office on 23 April 1990.

Leslie: How does Buddhism view war?

Bloom: Buddhism is essentially a religion of non-violence. Part of this is a reaction to the animal sacrifice that was part of the Indian religious and cultural context that Buddhism grew out of. The religion teaches that all creatures have a right to life and are connected in the karmic cycle of life, death rebirth. One is not to injure another person or another creature. One is expected not to harm another living person because of these principles of mutual connection and interdependence. What hurts me hurts you and whatever hurts you, hurts me. We are all part of an inter-related universal system.

Leslie: I believe Thich Nhat Hanh, whom I have read, calls that concept interbeing.

Bloom: All Buddhism is based on the concept of the oneness of all things. It speaks of not only human beings, but all sentient beings, all beings capable of perceiving and feeling things. This concept has been accused of devaluing human life, but that is certainly not its intent. The real intent

is to emphasize that all living beings are part of the same vast reality even down to the lowest life form. Buddhism does explain that the human level is the only one where one can seek enlightenment. All other living beings are locked into their karmic destiny. The human will can develop full spiritual potential and achieve enlightenment. Although some take the reincarnation cycle literally, I take it symbolically.

Leslie: What motivates human beings to wage war?

Bloom: Greed, hate, the desire to dominate and other delusions of the ego motivate people's actions of violence. Acting in such a manner harms another, harms you by accenting negative aspects within you, reinforces violence in the universal system and generates bad karma. Such a way of living creates a karma of violence in your life and eventually you will come to a violent end. Living by the sword and dying by the sword so to speak. Thus, Buddhism seeks to remedy violence in the world by fostering respect, empathy, identify and sense of connection with all sentient beings. After all, we are the cumulative result of our bad and good experiences over decades. Other human beings and other sentient beings contribute in ways known and ways unknown to our process of spiritual evolution. This idea of inter-connectedness means that your spiritual fulfillment is related to the spiritual fulfillment of others. Thus, you wish to help others rather than harm others. This in turn helps you. These ideas are deeply rooted in Buddhism.

Leslie: So Buddhism takes a dim view of the use of force in general?

Bloom: Yes. The Buddha, in one sutra, is asked by leaders how their kingdoms may survive. The counsel that Buddha gives is moral and ethical guidance for governing in a humane and democratic manner. The model for community and national life is reconciliation. One great Buddhist king, Asoka who ruled around the Third Century BC, after engaging in a military victory which resulted in a great slaughter of his enemies, felt remorse and spent the rest of his reign putting up public pillars of Buddhist moral teachings. A Buddhist ruler is expected to foster spiritual principles in society. Throughout history many kings sought to promote Buddhism in their realms in the Platonic or Confucian sense of a philosopher-king.

Leslie: Has Buddhism been identified with wars waged by states?

Bloom: Some Buddhist teachers taught that kings and laypeople had a responsibility to defend the dharma, defend the Buddhist faith, by force if necessary. This stream of thought of course, made Buddhism an ally of the existing political institutions from time to time. However, the Buddhist sutras themselves do not discuss authority using force in what we would call just war. Buddhism has had a social impact in the Eastern societies creating hospitals, social work institutions and monastery programs to rehabilitate criminals. Unlike the Augustinian dualistic view of the City of Man versus the city

of God, Buddhism does not define the political role of coercion, though it is realistic about the world. In Japan, for example, there was a ritual of releasing doves after a battle in expiation for having to kill.

Leslie: So Buddhism does recognize the need to use force sometimes?

Bloom: Yes, it does. However, one must not glory in the use of violence. This is the problem of developing a warrior class. One should only use force when necessary, but not joyously seek opportunities to do so. Karmic duty may mandate a king using force, but if the king is unwise or unjust, his karma may run out and his rule end. The Chinese, of course, call this the Mandate of Heaven. Although the kings and emperors ruled in an autocratic system, this concept helped to encourage them to rule with benevolence. I think, in general, this expectation of divine retribution for failing to rule wisely kept the average Eastern ruler from engaging in some of the barbarism kings in Europe did.

Leslie: So Buddhism looks at the use of force on a case by case basis?

Bloom: Generally, yes. War is not really dealt with in the abstract. I remember once assisting a young man who converted to Buddhism and sought release from the military on the conscientious objector basis. He was eventually released. Military service is essentially an individual choice of conscience. The sutras, like the New Testament books, lean

toward non-violence, but they do not clearly state that one should not be in the military. Unlike the Old Testament, which you know has passages advocated war against the enemies of Yahweh, the sutras do not advocate violence for a divine cause. There were, of course, instances where Chinese Buddhist monks organized armies for the protection of their monasteries. Whenever this did get out of hand it was not because of Buddhist teaching, but due to ego circumventing the religion. Buddhism does indeed have a sense of social consciousness. One need only point to the work of the Buddhist Peace Fellowship, the Dalai Lama and Thich Nhat Hanh.

Leslie: What about Buddhism in Japan?

Bloom: There is a lot of discussion among Japanese Buddhists now about the difference between Buddha dharma and royal or secular dharma. Unfortunately during the period of fascism before and during the Second World War many Japanese Buddhists were swept up in the wave of nationalism and militarism. These people merged the Buddha dharma, or teachings of Buddhism, with the royal dharma, or teachings of the state. They taught that Amida Buddha was manifest in the Emperor and that Buddhists should obey the state always. Some Buddhists in Japan did refuse to take the loyalty oaths during this period.

Leslie: What about the samurai warriors adopting Zen-Buddhism as their personal religion and the martial arts?

Bloom: The martial arts are essentially defensive. One seeks to compassionately neutralize the opponent with his own energy

and momentum. By seeking unity with the opponent one can stop him from harming you without damaging or destroying him. Zen was attractive to the samurai not because the tradition advocated violence, but due to the spiritual principles and discipline it fostered. The Zen emphasis on losing ego and becoming selfless encourages a sense of service and the ability to be in harmony with all things, including an opponent. This is the influence of Taoism in Zen.

Leslie: The, in military sense, you are more concerned with countering the enemy's rather than destroying the enemy outright?

Bloom: Yes, exactly. Unfortunately, in the West, such things as karate are used for sport, competition, contest and showing superiority rather than remaining consistent with the true defensive spirit of the martial arts. The samurai also found Zen attractive because of emphasis on things like awareness, preparation for death, or whatever reality might come including combat, and focusing on the whole person. Of course, the samurai also utilized such objects as amulets and talisman from other religious traditions in Japan also. Suzuki speaks of these matters in his writings.

Leslie: In contemporary Buddhism, then, the only just war is one of self-defense?

Bloom: Ideally, nations would seek to resolve their differences before the use of force would be necessary. But, if one must fight as a citizen in the defense of their nation, Buddhism could find that acceptable. Of course, the danger in

that is that no nations claim to be aggressors. Every war is wrapped in the rhetoric of self-defense. Buddhism must not lose its prophetic element and be coopted by the secular dharma or the state as has happened in the past.

Leslie: Thank you for your time.

Bloom: You're certainly welcome.

APPENDIX VIII

INTERVIEW WITH REV GWYNNE SCHULTZ

The Rev. Gwynne Schultz is an ordained minister in the United Church of Christ and a spiritual director of the Stillpoint Retreat Center in Santa Barbara, California where she pastored a church until recently. The interview took place at her home on 25 April 1990.

Leslie: What is your perspective on the view of Christianity, and any other spiritual path, on the use of force by nations?

Schultz: Christians are confused on the issue of war. In seminary I wrote a paper on pacifism. Jesus essentially taught that Christians wait and anticipate the intervention of God. However, since the Lord did not intervene as soon as the early Church expected eschatology was reinterpreted. As Christianity became institutionalized, especially after it became the imperial religion, you see the religion become more identified with state policy. This, of course, included identification with state policy about the use of force.

Leslie: What about the war and violence described in the passages of Revelation?

Schultz: Well, Revelation is about the end of the world. That's expected to be cataclysmic. Defeating evil, which is seductive and elusive, would require a great cosmic sorting out of things. This final battle is indeed expected to be a cataclysm. I believe the conversion of Constantine begins the process where, in Christianity becoming the imperial religion of the Roman Empire, the will of God and the will of the state

are mixed up together. The writings of Eusebius are an example of how Christianity and imperial ideology are wed. This may all be cultural, but it is not scriptural.

Leslie: The tension between what is Biblical and what is cultural is a continuing struggle, isn't it?

Schultz: Exactly. Throughout history people rise up within Christianity to call us back to what is scriptural. I think the Quakers are one example of a movement seeking to call us back to the teachings of Jesus. There is, however, a great deal of confusion about how do we live the ethic of Jesus in the real world where enemies exist and military force is necessary. We justify all wars as just causes, but there is still confusion for Christians on the use of force. This confusion is really clear when you have two nations in battle, or two sides engaged in conflict, and both claim that God is on their side.

Leslie: Like a crusade?

Schultz: Sure, like a crusade or like the Second World War. The American and German visions of God were different, but both felt that they were engaged in a holy war doing the will of Heaven. The Old Testament perception that God works through nations and wars can be very confusing when contrasted with the teachings of Jesus.

Leslie: What about Romans 13 and the passages in the Gospels where Jesus speaks of the sword?

Schultz: I think the passages are interpreted out of context. Jesus, Paul and the earliest Christians taught the world was

coming to an end. Many passages must be interpreted eschatologically with an understanding that the earliest Church expected the end of time soon as was preparing for that. The references of Jesus saying he was coming to bring a sword are related to the cataclysmic end of history to come. This eschaton event was expected to be dramatic, violent and radical. The changes were not in the political order, but in relationships of reconciliation between God and humanity, human being and human being and even enemy and enemy. Again, I think the philosophy of the Quakers has picked up on this.

Leslie: Are there times, from a Christian perspective, when the use of force by nations is justifiable?

Schultz: That is the difficult question! I am not a pacifist, although maybe I should be based on the teachings of Christ about trust, love and reconciliation. A Christian can be assertive, but not aggressive. On the individual level, I would do whatever I needed to do to protect my children and grand-children if they were threatened by aggression. I sorrow when human beings can not reconcile enough to each other to prevent the recourse to force. But, in the real world that is the case. There is a continuum with aggression on one extreme and pacifism on the other extreme. Things like just war, self-defense, deterrence and reconciliation fall on various points along the continuum. Christianity calls us to be in the proper place on the continuum in relation to the use of force in a given situation. The ultimate goal, however, in my opinion, is to finally reach the point in the world where

use of force is no longer necessary.

Leslie: I like your analogy. A continuum is easy to visualize. Schultz: One concern I have about the future is fundamentalist Islam. I expect trouble with nations which adhere to this faith, like Iran, and the Western nations like the U. S.. These types of Muslims do not respond at all to reconciliation, trust, love and other Judeo-Christian philosophical principles. Fundamentalist Islam is a militaristic philosophy that insures entrance into heaven if one dies in combat. One cannot get more militaristic than that! Although the Quakers would say a pure Christian response would be surrender rather than use force for self-defense, there is where we part company. It would certainly not be good for our way of life, our religion and our culture to allow fundamentalist Islam to just take over. I think Communism and the Soviet Union will look like pussycats in relation to the Islamic fundamentalist threat looming on the horizon. It is the exact opposite of the Christian ideal of reconciliation we are discussing.

Leslie: Is this Christian ideal also embodied in feminist theology?

Schultz: I think that feminist theology and the values inherent in the theological idea of the Goddess seeks to recapture the reconciliation teachings of Jesus because they are consistent with the spiritual aspects of the feminine principle. Jesus surrendering himself to Pilate in a long-suffering patient manner is symbolic of this. The "male thing

to do" would have been to go down fighting "like a man" rather than surrender and be crucified. Men, especially in the time of Jesus, were supposed to die in battle. Christ is an archetype for both the male principle and the female principle.

Leslie: What about the archetype of Athena?

Schultz: The pantheons of gods and goddesses in the old pre-Christian religions cover the entire spectrum of the human existence, male in the gods and female in the goddesses. Of course, males have female characteristics and females have male characteristics. Athena symbolizes the assertive aspect of the female. Margaret Thatcher and Golda Meir are examples of assertive women who have been able to utilize the male principle for political success. Patricia Schroder is an example of a woman who remains consistent with the feminine principle as a politician. When I graduated from seminary all I had were male models for how to do ministry. Now, after thirty years I have evolved into a style of ministry, one much more valuable I might add, that involves both the masculine and feminine aspects of spirituality and ministry. Once female political leadership is successful in operating from the masculine principle, then women will be allowed to operate from the feminine principle. I think a different view of war as necessary, but not something to be glorified, will grow in acceptance.

Leslie: In summary then, the Christian view of war leans towards nonviolence, but sees the occasional use of force as a

necessary evil.

Schultz: Christianity is a religion that seeks to live in the world rather than escape from the world. It will always involve a tension between the real and the ideal. Christians, in their living in the world, seek to bring Christianity into the real world in which they live. God intends for us to do that. However, the danger is that we get seduced into the world and lose the essential message of Jesus in the process of seduction. Throughout history this has happened too often. Though over-identification of Christianity with the state and war is a corruption of the message of Christ, necessity dictates that we practice self-defense. Although it sometimes strays from the ideal, the United States is idealistic about appropriate use of force for just causes. The task of the Church is to be prophetic and call Christians and society back to the message of Jesus. I like the idea of chaplains who pastor in the military. Your presence there serves a great spiritual purpose.

Leslie: Thank you very much.

Schultz: You're welcome.

APPENDIX IX

INTERVIEW WITH CHAPLAIN JOHNATHAN PANITZ

Chaplain Johnathan Panitz is a lieutenant commander in the US Navy Chaplain corps and an ordained rabbi of the Jewish faith. He is station at the Chapel of Hope in Naval Educational Training Command in Newport, Rhode Island. The interview took place in his office on 10 May 1990.

Leslie: What is the view of Judaism on war and the use of force?

Panitz: Judaism has rules on protecting civilians and the environment and regulations on war. There are different types of war in Judaism. One is what is called the "war of permission" which dates back to the period of the United Monarch. It was waged at the urging of the monarch for expansion with the permission of the religious leadership. This concept, of course, ended when the United Monarchy split into the Northern and southern kingdoms. In a war of permission the only men used for military service were single with no marital or economic commitments. It was considered unfair for newlyweds, fathers and such to engage in a war for expansion. There was no immediate threat.

Leslie: The army was kind of a combination of a people's militia and a professional military, then?

Panitz: Exactly. The second kind is called the "war of obligation" or obligatory war. The type of war that Israel fought to conquer Canaan, a "war of possession," fits here. Another kind of obligatory war is one fought for defense

purposes. If Israelite territory was invaded or threatened a use of force for self-defense was an obligation. In both the war of permission or the war of obligation the military commander was required to advise the enemy that peace could still be negotiated if the other side desired to avoid a battle. An olive branch of peace was extended. Advance notice would also be begin that the civilian population would not be considered targets. In war, the Israelite army was forbidden from practicing a "scorched earth" policy destroying the environment. The chaplain of the Israelite forces also had to read all the rules and regulations of war to the troops before they were deployed. In one modern times however, we can really only speak of obligatory wars of defense or preemption. In wars of defense the rules and regulations are clear. However, in a war of pre-emption the rules and regulations are not so clear.

Leslie: Why is that?

Panitz: Jewish ethical concerns relating to warning the enemy or seeking to arrange for peace before combat creates a problem if you must make a pre-emptive strike. In that case, a different ethical framework is required. Judaism has two concepts of life. One is high moral life. The other is basic moral life. Striving for the best for self, relationships, the world and all humanity is the basis of high moral life. Basic moral life, on the other hand, means the fundamental aspects of human existence like eating and breathing.

Leslie: The ideal world and the real world?

Panitz: Somewhat, yes. Judaism asks under what circumstances would we be willing to live and then evaluates the rules and regulations of war in that context. One Jewish view would say use of thermonuclear weapons abandons God's mandate not to follow a scorched earth policy. Another Jewish view, the one I accept, is that to allow an enemy to overwhelm and dominate you destroys both high moral life and basic moral life. No Jew, or any person loving democracy, could live under the regimes some of our enemies would like to impose if surrender took place. Thus, in the second view, thermonuclear weapons serve the role of deterrence to prevent attack, conquest or annihilation by an enemy force. No unilateral disarmament to abandon your deterrence in this ethical framework.

Leslie: What about the annihilation of the Canaanites in the wars of possession?

Panitz: In Joshua's time the warriors were told not to take the booty or else punishment would result. The devastation was required because the people and the land was considered idolatrous. It had to be cleansed, purged and then consecrated for God. All trances of the idolatrous society was to be obliterated. The ethic we discussed, the war of permission and the war of obligation, was developed during the United Monarchy. It was a different era.

Leslie: Has the diaspora and the establishment of Israel changed that ethic any?

Panitz: No. Israel is a quasi-theocratic state. The military is run in a secular manner, but with religious

advisors. The Israeli military is guided by the ethical principles of Judaism I mentioned earlier. The recent wars, like the Six Day War, were fought in harmony with the Jewish principles of war. For example, Egyptian soldiers though surrounded, were allowed to walk away. Although there may be individual abuses, as there always are in war, the general principles of Judaism about the use of force are observed. A pre-emptive strike is a response to an immediate threat to high moral life or basic life. Leslie: What about the Israeli policy of military retaliation against terrorist acts? Panitz: That is not based on Jewish ethic. It is the state of Israel's belief that if terrorism is not responded to it will continue unchecked. Although Judaism is not, and never has been a pacifist religion, it is a religion of peace. How one lives religiously and peacefully in the real world is always the challenge. There is no Hebrew word for "holy war," only the types of wars have already discussed. Judaism says that one may give up one's life to avoid being forced to kill another human being, to avoid being forced to commit idolatry or to avoid being forced to practice sexual immorality. The mandate for resistance, by force if necessary is part of the Jewish ethic. Leslie: Thank you for your time. Panitz: You're welcome.

APPENDIX X

MO TZU'S RITES FOR DEFENSIVE WAR

When an enemy comes from the East, build an altar towards the East, eight feet high, and a hall with eight sides. Let eight men eighty years old preside over the offerings. They hold a blue banner with the Blue God (shen) painted upon it, and eight men eight feet tall with eight bows shoot eight arrows and no more. The general of the troops, dressed in blue, is then to sacrifice a cock.

It would be tedious to go through all four points of the compass in full. For the south, the number is seven, the colour red and the sacrifice a dog; for the west, the equivalences are nine, white, and a goat; for the north, six, black, and a pig. The shapes of cloud-vapours are to be observed. There are those that stand for a commander-in-chief, for a lesser general, for coming and going, for victory and defeat. By understanding these, one may know whether the issue will be favorable or unfavorable.

All the shamans (wu), medicine men and soothsayers are to have their appointed places, where they are to preside over the preparation of herbs. A good house is to be chosen for their quarter. The shamans must be near the public shrine. The shamans and soothsayers tell the truth to the commander of the defenses, and he alone is to know the true facts, as reported by

the shamans, soothsayers and inspectors of cloud-vapours.
Those who go in and out spreading rumors and creating panic
among the officials and people must be tracked down and
ruthlessly punished.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aho, James A. Religious Mythology and the Art of War.
Westport, CN: Greenwood Press, 1981.
- Amin, Aqueel El-. "Al-Islam and the Military " Muslim Journal,
30 March 1990, p. 17.
- Interview with Aqueel El-Amin, Imam, Masjid Taqwa, San Diego,
CA: 20 April 1990
- Bainton, Ronald H. Christian Attitudes Toward War and Peace.
Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1960.
- Banks, (ed), Arthur S. Political Handbook of the World. New
York: CSA Publications, 1989.
- Bellah, Robert N. Religion and Progress in Modern Asia. New
York: Free Press, 1965.
- The Bible. New International Version.
- Interview with Dr. Alan Bloom, Dean, Institute for Buddhist
Studies, Berkeley, CA: 23 April 1990.
- Bunce, William K. Religions in Japan. Rutland, VT: Charles
E. Tuttle Co., 1960
- Interview with Dr. Norman Chambers, Director, Multi-Cultural
Counseling Center, San Diego, CA: 19 April 1990.
- Cheung, Tai Ming. "Command of the Seas." Far Eastern
Economic Review, 27 July 1989, p. 20.
- Cheung, Tai Ming. "Sealanes Strategy." Far Eastern Economic
Review, 27 July 1989, pp. 16-18.
- Chi-yun, Chang. Confucianism: A Modern Interpretation.
Taiwan: Hwa Kang Press, 1980.

Creel, H.D. Chinese Thought from Confucious to Mao Tse Tung.

New York: Vintage Books, 1938.

de Bary, William Theodore ed., The Buddhist Tradition in

India, China and Japan. New York: Vintage Books/Random House, 1972.

Dekmejian, R. Hrair. Islam in Revolution. Syracuse, NY:

Syracuse University Press, 1985.

Deutsch, Elliot, translator, The Bhagavad-Gita. New York:

Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.

Dian, Zara. "Religion and National Security in Southeast

Asia." Asian Defense Journal, December, 1989, p. 3.

Dimont, Max I. Jews, God and History. New York: Signet

Books, 1962.

Interview with Drutakarma, Educator, Hare Krishna Temple, San

Diego, Ca: 20 April 1990.

Eerdman's Handbook of the World's Religions. Grand Rapids,

MI: William B. Eerdman's Publishing Company, 1982.

Eisler, Riane. The Chalice and the Blade. San Francisco:

Harper and Row, 1987.

Enayet, Hamid. Modern Islamic Political Thought. Austin, TX:

University of Texas Press, 1982.

Farmer, William R. Maccabees, Zealots and Josephus. New York:

Columbia University Press, 1958.

Ferguson, John. War and Peace in the World's Religions. New

York: Oxford University Press, 1974.

"First Steps" The Economist, 9 December, 1989, p. 30.

- Fraser, Antonia. The Warrior Queens. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1989.
- Ganguly, Sumit. The Origins of War in South Asia. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1986.
- Gibson, Micheal. The Samurai of Japan. London: Wayland Publishers, 1973.
- "Goddess Worship: An Overview." The Encyclopedia of Religion. 1987 ed. v. 6, pp. 36-45.
- Griffith, Samuel B., translator. Sun Tzu. The Art of War. New York: Oxford University Press, 1971.
- Herrigel, Eugen. Zen in the Art of Archery. New York: Vantage Books, 1971.
- Hertz, J. H., ed. Pentateuch and Haftorahs. 2nd ed. London: Soncino Press, 1960.
- Holmes, Arthur F. War and Christian Ethics. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1975.
- Holton, D.C. Modern Japanese and Shinto Nationalism. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1943.
- Howard, Micheal and Paret, Peter, ed. Carl von Clausewitz. On War. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1984.
- Interview with Ted Kardesh, Instructor, Taoist Sanctuary of San Diego, San Diego, CA: 19 April 1990.
- Khadduri, Majid. War and Peace in the Law of Islam. Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press, 1955.
- Khomeini, Ruholla. Islam and Revolution. Berkeley: Mizan Press, 1981.

- Koller, John M. Oriental Philosophies. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1970
- Kramer, Martin, ed. Shi'ism. Resistance and Revolution. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1987.
- Lama, The Dalai. My Land and My People. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.
- Leon-Dufour, Xavier. Dictionary of Biblical Theology. New York: The Seabury Press, 1973.
- Lewy, Guenter. Religion and Revolution. New York: Oxford University Press, 1974.
- Lewis, Archibald. Knights and Samurai. London: Temple Smith, 1974.
- Ling, Trevor. Buddhism, Imperialism and War. London: George, Allen and Unwin, 1979.
- Lippman, Thomas W. Understanding Islam. New York: New American Library, 1982.
- Loye, David. "Who Murdered Peace and Prosperity?" New Age Journal, July/August 1987, p. 36.
- Muhammed, Wallace D. "Al-Islam for African-Americans." Lecture. Masjid Al-Fatir, Chicago: 30 March 1990.
- Mustafaa, Ayesha K. "Striving with God-given Faculties." Muslim Journal. 2 March 1990, pp. 3 and 17.
- Muzaffarabad, Salamat Ali in. "Line of Conflict." Far Eastern Economic Review, 10 May 1990, pp. 18-19.
- Nitobe, Inazo. Bushido: The Soul of Japan. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1905.
- "The Odds Against V. P. Singh." The Economist, 23 December

1989, p. 37.

Interview with Ms. Vanda Osmon, Consultant, Women's Issues and Earth Religions, Carl Rogers Institute for Person-Approaches to Peace, La Jolla, CA: 19 April 1990.

Interview with Chaplain Johnathan Panitz, Jewish Chaplain, Chapel of Hope, Newport, RI: 10 May 1990.

Paolucci, Henry, ed. The Political Writings of St. Augustine. Chicago: Regnery Gateway, 1962.

Parrinder, Geoffrey, ed. World Religions From Ancient History to the Present. New York: Facts on File Publications, 1984.

Pike, Diane Kennedy and Kennedy, R. Scott. The Wilderness Revolt. New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1972.

Pipes, Daniel. In the Path of God. New York: Basic Books, 1983.

Rapport, David C. and Alexander, Yonah. The Morality of Terrorism. New York: Pergamon Press, 1982.

Ratti, Oscar and Westbrook, Adele. Secrets of the Samurai. Rutland, VT: Charles E. Tuttle, Inc., 1973.

Renou, Louis, ed. Hinduism. New York: George Braziller, 1962.

Roberts, D. S. Islam: A Concise Introduction. San Francisco, Harper and Row, 1981.

Rule, Shiela. "Dalai Lama Wins Nobel Peace Prize." New York Times, 6 October 1989, p. A-6.

Sabree, Joan. "For the West Coast, It All Began Here in San Diego." Muslim Journal, 2 March 1990, pp. 3 and 17.

- Interview with Rev. Gwynne Schultz, Spiritual Director,
Stillpoint, Santa Barbara, CA: 25 April 1990.
- Seward, Desmond. The Monks of War. Hamden, CT: Archon
Books, 1972.
- Sjoo, Monica and Mor, Barbara. The Great Cosmic Mother. San
Francisco: Harper and Row, 1987.
- Smith, Bardwell, ed. Religion and the Legitimation of Power
in Sri Lanka. Chambersburg, PA: Anima Books/Conococheague
Associates, Inc., 1978.
- Smith, Donald Eugene. Religion, Politics and Social Change in
the Third World. New York: Free Press, 1971.
- Spretnak, Charlene, ed. The Politics of Women's Spirituality.
New York: Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1982.
- Stone, Merlin. When God Was a Woman. New York: Harvest/HBJ,
1976.
- Suksamran, Somboon. Buddhism and Politics in Thailand.
Singapore: The Institute of Southeast Asian Studies,
1982.
- Tsunoda, Ryusaku, ed. Sources of Japanese Tradition. New
York: Columbia University Press, 1958.
- Turnbull, S. R. The Samurai: A Military History. New York:
Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1977.
- US Catholic Conference (of Bishops). The Challenge of Peace:
God's Promise and Our Response. Washington, D.C., 1983.
- Varley, H. Paul. The Samurai: A Military History. New York:
Macmillan Publishing Co. 1977.
- "Vedic Religion." Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics. 1966

- ed. v. 12, p. 601.
- Waldron, Arthur. "Sun Tzu." Lecture. Naval War College.
Newport, R.I.: 28 August 1989.
- Waley, Arthur, translator. The Analects of Confucius. New
York: Vintage Books, 1938.
- Waley, Arthur. Three Ways of Thought in China. Stanford, CA:
Stanford University Press, 1982.
- Walker, Barbara. The Women's Encyclopedia of Myths and
Secrets. New York: Harper and Row, 1983.
- Watson, Burton, translator. Basic Writings of Mo Tzu, Hsun
Tzu and Han Fei Tzu. New York: Columbia University
Press, 1967.
- Interview with Rev. Madelon Wheeler-Gibb, Pastor, Arcadia
Congregational Church, Arcadia, CA: 21 April 1990.
- "Which Way for US Naval Power in the Asia-Pacific Region?"
Asian Defense Journal. December, 1989, pp. 12-19.
- Wilhelm, Dietl. Holy War. New York: Macmilian Publishing
Co., 1984.
- Wing, R. L., translator. The Tao of Power. New York:
Doubleday Press, 1986.
- Wolpert, Stanley. A New History of India. 3rd. ed. New York:
Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Wright, Arthur F. Studies in Chinese Thought. Chicago:
University of Chicago Press, 1953.

yadin, Yigael. The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light
Against the Sons of Darkness. London: Oxford University
Press, 1962.

Yeh, Theodore T. Y. Confucianism, Christianity and China. New
York: Philosophical Library, 1969.